



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

905
A615



LELAND • STANFORD • JUNIOR • UNIVERSITY

THE
ANNUAL REGISTER.
1884.

ALL THE VOLUMES OF THE NEW SERIES OF THE

ANNUAL REGISTER

1863 to 1883

MAY BE HAD.

THE
ANNUAL REGISTER:

A
REVIEW OF PUBLIC EVENTS AT HOME
AND ABROAD,
FOR THE YEAR
1884.

NEW SERIES.

LONDON:
RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO PLACE.
LONGMANS & CO.; SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO.; HAMILTON & CO.;
HOULSTON & SONS; SMITH, ELDER, & CO.; R. BUMPUS;
H. SOTHERAN & CO.; BICKERS & SON; J. TOOVEY;
J. WHIELDON; R. WASHBOURNE.

1885.

270944

LONDON : PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOOD AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

YHAFAL! 08078AT2

CONTENTS.

PART I.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

The position of the Ministry—Egypt and South Africa—The Liberal Circular—Franchise and Redistribution—Mr. Chamberlain and the Shipowners—Politics in the Provinces—The Public Press and the Government—General Gordon's Mission *page* [1

CHAPTER II.

Meeting of Parliament—Debates on the Address—Mr. Bourke's Amendment—Collapse of the Debate—Mr. Chaplin's Amendment—Irish Affairs—Mr. Bradlaugh's Vote and Resignation—The Vote of Censure in the Lords and Commons—Royal Commission on Housing the Poor—Retirement of the Speaker—Election of his Successor [15

CHAPTER III.

THE EGYPTIAN IMBROGLIO.

General Gordon's Mission—The Expedition to Suakim—The Supplementary Estimate for Expenditure in Egypt—Mr. Labouchere's Amendment—Debate on General Gordon's Position—Proposed Conference—The Second Vote of Censure—Attitude of Messrs. Goschen and Forster—Negotiations with France—The Multiple Control—Earl Grey on the Situation—The Anglo-French Agreement—Meeting of the Conference—The Third Vote of Censure—The Conference and its Outcome [52

CHAPTER IV.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

Franchise Bill introduced—Sir John Hay's Amendment—Read a first time—Debate on the Second Reading—Lord John Manners' Amendment—Redistribution—Extension of the Bill to Ireland—Mr. Goschen's explanation—Defeat of the Opposition—Lord Salisbury at Manchester—Parliamentary delays—Mr. Raikes' instructions—The Disunion of the Conservative Party—Lord R. Churchill and the Council of the National Union—Letter to Lord Salisbury—The Franchise Bill in Committee—Mr. Brodrick's motion to exclude Ireland—The Commencement of the Act—Women's Suffrage—Bill read a third time—Sent up to the Lords—Earl Cairns' Amendment on second reading—Defeat of the Government—Mr. Gladstone's declaration—The "secret negotiations"—Lord Wemyss' Motion for the second reading—Lord Redesdale and the Government—The Government and the Redistribution Bill—Close of the Session [87

CHAPTER V.

LEGISLATION OF THE SESSION.

Russia and Central Asia—Fenianism in London—Transvaal Affairs—The Vacancy at Leicester—The Merchant Shipping Bill—Army Estimates, Navy Estimates, and the State of the Navy—The Cattle Plague Bill—Bills for the Enfranchisement of Copyholds and Leaseholds—For the removal of Bishops from the House of Lords—Local Taxation—Government of London Bill—Death of the Duke of Albany—Lord Randolph Churchill and the Opposition leaders—The Budget—Gold Coinage Bill—National Debt Conversion Bill—The Irish Land Act—Lord Rosebery's Motion to Reform the House of Lords—The Estimates in Committee—The Prorogation page [158]

CHAPTER VI.

THE AUTUMN RECESS.

Earl Cowper's Letter—Conservative Gathering at Nostell Priory—Mr. Gladstone in Midlothian—Mr. Trevelyan at Glasgow—Sir S. Northcote at Edinburgh—Mr. Morley at Newcastle—Mr. Gladstone's return from Scotland—Lord Salisbury on Redistribution—The Conservative Campaign in Scotland—Lord Hartington's Offer—Mr. Chamberlain at Hanley—The "Standard's" Redistribution Scheme—The Gathering at Chatsworth—Mr. Fawcett's Speech—Mr. Chamberlain in Wales—The State of the Navy—Colonial and Foreign Affairs [198]

CHAPTER VII.

THE WINTER SESSION.

The Meeting of Parliament—Debate on the Address—The Government Programme—State of Ireland—Mr. Chamberlain and the Birmingham Riots—South Africa—The Franchise Bill in the Commons—Mr. E. Stanhope's Amendment—The Bill sent to the Lords—Rumour of Compromise—The Negotiations—Their Issue—The Redistribution Bill introduced—Mr. Courtney's Resignation—The Franchise Bill passed—Egyptian Affairs—Increase of Income Tax—State of the Navy—General Summary [232]

FOREIGN HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

FRANCE AND ITALY [269]

CHAPTER II.

GERMANY [289]

CHAPTER III.

EASTERN EUROPE—AUSTRIA-HUNGARY—RUSSIA—TURKEY AND THE MINOR STATES OF EASTERN EUROPE [300]

CHAPTER IV.

WESTERN STATES OF EUROPE—BELGIUM—THE NETHERLANDS—SWITZERLAND—SPAIN—PORTUGAL—DENMARK—NORWAY—SWEDEN [315]

CHAPTER V.

ASIA—INDIA, CENTRAL ASIA, AND AFGHANISTAN—INDIAN FRONTIERS— BRITISH INDIA—CHINA—JAPAN AND COREA	page [343
--	-----------

CHAPTER VI.

AFRICA—SOUTH AFRICA—EGYPT—THE CONGO AND MADAGASCAR . .	[378
--	------

CHAPTER VII.

AMERICA—UNITED STATES—MEXICO—WEST INDIES—BRAZIL—CHILI AND PERU	[397
---	------

CHAPTER VIII.

AUSTRALASIA	[423
-----------------------	------

PART II.

CHRONICLE OF EVENTS.	1
RETROSPECT OF LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART	54
OBITUARY OF EMINENT PERSONS	111
INDEX	169

ERRATA IN ANNUAL REGISTER 1883.

PART I.

- P. [5, line 40, for "his" read "the."
 - P. [30, line 37, for "W." read "H."
 - P. [41, line 10, for "which" read "and."
 - P. [43, line 2, for "weighed" read "leaned."
 - P. [60, line 22, insert "doubtful" after "was."
 - P. [165, last line but 2, for "Frith" read "Firth."
 - P. [265, line 41, for "1850" read "1830."
 - P. [277, line 6, for "treaty" read "protocol."
 - Pp. [379 and [381, for "Goubert" read "Joubert."
 - P. [380, line 18, for "Dutort and Sinit" read "Dutoit and Smit."
-

PART II.

- P. 62, line 24, for "Countess of" read "Viscountess."
- P. 32, line 13, for "papyrus" read "leather roll."
- P. 43, line 20, for "Hampstead" read "Hempstead."
- P. 19, line 18, for "London Corporation" read "Privy Council."
- P. 148, 1st col. line 24, for "where he died on May 14" read "but he died at Merton Rectory, Norfolk, on June 14."
- P. 163, line 5, for "Blayden" read "Blagden."
- P. 177, line 7, for "grandson" read "nephew."
- P. 183 (Nov. 7), for "Clifton" read "Taunton."
- P. 188, line 42, for "Borden, Norfolk" read "Borden, Kent."

ANNUAL REGISTER

FOR THE YEAR

1884.

PART I.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

The position of the Ministry—Egypt and South Africa—The Liberal Circular—Franchise and Redistribution—Mr. Chamberlain and the Shipowners—Politics in the Provinces—The Public Press and the Government—General Gordon's Mission.

THE new year found Mr. Gladstone's Ministry apparently as strongly established in public favour, after four Sessions of almost unexampled difficulties, as it had been on its first accession to office. If from certain quarters, and on various questions, the tones of hostile criticism sounded louder, in others opposition was dying away, and a sense of the services rendered by the Liberals to the country was silently, though perhaps grudgingly, springing up. The condition of Ireland, although still far from satisfactory, showed signs of decided amendment, and held out the promise of an increasing material prosperity; whilst English statesmen of all parties were beginning to recognise that the Home Rule movement of that country was an honest expression of national feeling, not merely the stalking-horse of a few self-interested politicians, or the craze of a handful of hare-brained enthusiasts. A spokesman of the party, Mr. Healy, had described the movement in words which were accepted as a fair exposition of the Irish views. "It is not merely Mr. Parnell the Irish people are following, but their proper interests—the gratification of their national pride, the humiliation of their oppressors, the achievement of the full measure of their rights." On the Franchise question the Ministry seemed able to reckon upon the firm support of all their own

adherents, whilst their opponents threatened opposition, not to the principle of an uniform franchise, but on the ground that the Redistribution Scheme of the Government should accompany any reduction or extension of the voting qualification.

Abroad the Ministerial prospects were scarcely so bright. A conviction was rapidly growing that the policy pursued in Egypt had committed the country to a task of which the responsible Ministers failed to recognise the magnitude. Week after week the Cabinet had seemed to be hoping that something might "turn up" which would relieve this country from further responsibility and expense. But for once the confidently-expected "unforeseen" did not happen, and week by week English credit and honour were becoming more and more deeply committed to a line of action which encouraged the opponents of the Ministry to demand from Mr. Gladstone a withdrawal of his promise to abstain from any semblance of a British Protectorate exercised at Cairo or elsewhere in the Valley of the Nile, and to make a step which the Conservatives hoped might irrevocably commit this country to an active and unveiled direction of Egyptian affairs. On the other hand, the Liberals were divided in their views and wishes. The Radical section of Mr. Gladstone's supporters loudly urged the immediate withdrawal of our troops and agents without delay, leaving to Tewfik and his pashas the task of settling terms with the Mahdi and his followers. Other Liberals, however, were not less urgent for the maintenance of the existing system, with a change, if necessary, of the existing instruments. If, according to these, Riaz Pasha were found too stubborn or impracticable, Nubar Pasha might be hoped to show himself more pliant, and if Tewfik himself were recalcitrant, another Khedive might be found to accept the headship of the State under the most precise restrictions. With tendencies so divergent amongst their own followers, it was not surprising that the Government should hesitate before committing itself to any decided course; and for their natural hesitancy they were upbraided by their fellow-countrymen, and taunted for allowing their administrators, like Mr. Clifford Lloyd, to display a zeal in the cause of reforms which they themselves seemed to regard as of doubtful expediency. At a Cabinet Council held immediately after the opening of the new year, stronger views prevailed, for, in spite of the expressed desire of the Egyptian Government to hold Khartoum, seriously compromised by General Hicks's defeat, orders were issued for its immediate evacuation, accompanied as of necessity by the abandonment of the whole of the Soudan to the Mahdi's troops. Wady Halfa, 350 miles north of Khartoum, was fixed upon as the limit of the Khedive's possessions, in defence of which he might expect to look for English aid—although protection would be given to seaports of the Red Sea.

In South Africa the retrocession of Basutoland to the Imperial Government had been, albeit grudgingly, acquiesced in by the

Boers, who hoped to secure within their own borders the great trade route between the Cape and Central Africa. Lord Derby, our Secretary for the Colonies, found an opportunity early in the new year to repudiate definitely the policy of *laissez faire*, which had up to that time prevailed, and substituted for it the acceptance of responsibilities towards the Colonists, the natives, and the semi-independent Boers.

But outside a very limited circle there was evidence of only a languid interest in either the foreign or colonial policy of the Government. The feeling that Mr. Gladstone would try every method of conciliation before having recourse to the costly arbitrament of force was dominant in all quarters, for not even the most indiscreet opponents of the Government ventured to advocate openly a renewal of the campaign in either North or South Africa, however ready they might be to hold up to scorn and obloquy the temporising policy of the Ministry. In respect of home affairs, the public pulse beat scarcely more strongly, except in the northern counties, and at a few isolated spots where a more or less temporary zeal had been kindled by rival statesmen and orators. In a certain number of boroughs, and in densely-crowded centres, there was an apparent desire at least for the removal of the anomalies by which men living within a few yards of one another, and under otherwise identical conditions, were arbitrarily included in, or excluded from, the list of voters. But it would be incorrect to say that there was evidence of any loud or persistent demand for an extension of the Franchise, from either voters or non-voters. This attitude of patient self-possession, as explained by the more ardent supporters of a new Reform Bill, was owing to the conviction that Mr. Gladstone would amply redeem his promises, and that they could count with certainty on the assimilation of the Borough and County Franchise, of which Mr. G. O. Trevelyan had for so many years been the champion, with but the lukewarm support of many of his actual colleagues on the Treasury Bench. This confidence was destined to be justified, but it remains an open question how much sooner the measure was introduced than many of its supporters liked. Of the actual position of parliamentary opinion on the subject some curious evidence was furnished by the *Pall Mall Gazette*. Towards the close of the preceding year the manager of that journal addressed a circular to the Liberal members of the House of Commons, asking them to reply to certain questions relative to the rumoured Ministerial Reform Bill. The actual strength of the Liberal party in the House of Commons at the beginning of the year was at least 350, and to each of them it is presumed the queries were sent. Of these, however, only 170—or barely 50 per cent.—sent any reply at all; although only two protested against the inquiry being made. The questions submitted pointed in fact towards the arrangement of the business of the coming Session, without regard

to the convenience or special views of the responsible Ministers, and ran as follows:—

1. What ought to be the first measure next Session?—(a) Reform; (b) London Municipal Reform; or (c) County Government, including Local Option.

2. Should Ireland be included in the Franchise Bill?

3. Should a measure of Redistribution—(a) Be attached to the Franchise Measure? (b) Be dealt with separately this Session? (c) Be postponed to another Session? or (d) Be postponed to a new Parliament?

4. Should Redistribution tend towards—(a) Equal electoral districts? or (b) Proportional representation?

5. Should the Government dissolve if the Lords throw out the Franchise Bill?

6. In the event of such a Dissolution, what is your estimate of the effect on the party in your own District?

7. General remarks.

Of those who replied, representing, it was said, constituencies numbering in the aggregate sixteen millions of inhabitants, 85 per cent. declared in favour of taking the Franchise Bill first, 5 per cent. gave precedence to London Municipal Reform, $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to the Reform of County Government, whilst a few wished to see the Franchise Bill and the London Municipal Reform Bill pushed forward simultaneously. The preference for the London over the County Bill as the second Government measure was less marked; whilst the inclusion of the principle of Local Option—or, at least, a radical reform of the Licensing Laws—was as strenuously urged by one section as it was protested against by another, which declared that the intermingling of the two questions would be fatal to both projected reforms. One member expressed the desire that the first Government measure should be the Reform of Parliamentary procedure; another (not a Home Ruler) that it should be the repeal of the Coercion Act; whilst Mr. Muntz also stood alone in desiring to see a Redistribution of Seats Bill produced before any alteration of the Franchise was attempted. On the question whether Ireland should be included in the Franchise Bill there was far greater unanimity of opinion, more than 95 per cent. (of those who replied to the circular) insisting that the same rights and privileges should be accorded to all the three Kingdoms of the Union. Not a few went further, declaring their determination to support no Reform Bill in which Ireland did not fully participate; but in many instances this declaration was qualified by an insistence on the need of a rearrangement of the existing Irish constituencies.

The moment for dealing with the whole question of Redistribution gave rise, however, to many divergencies. The majority—about 56 per cent.—were in favour of relegating it to a subsequent Session; 26 per cent. wished the two bills separated, but to have them discussed in the same Session; 8 per cent. only were in

favour of uniting the Franchise and Redistribution Schemes in one measure; whilst 10 per cent. would prefer to see the question of Redistribution dealt with by a new Parliament elected on the extended Franchise. But, although these were the individual views of the writers, the general feeling indicated was that the question of procedure should be left to the Government, and that its decision thereon should be cordially adopted by the party.

One Liberal member, however, Mr. Albert Grey, in addressing his constituents at Hexham (January 5) explained at full length the position he proposed to adopt, and it was thought that his words expressed the views of a considerable section of the independent Whigs. Mr. Grey, whilst expressing his readiness to concur in the abolition of the forty-shilling freeholder in the counties, and to enforce residence as a condition of the Franchise, on the condition that minorities should be protected, hastened to add that "if he did not know what sort of Redistribution Bill was to follow (the Franchise Bill), he must, as a matter of precaution, act as if that system of Redistribution which he considered to be the most objectionable would be the system hereafter decided on." And then he went on to say:—"Having in view the possibility of a system of Redistribution that would provide no security that minorities would obtain the representation that they were by their numbers entitled to receive, he should certainly vote in favour of any scheme which might tend to maintain the voting strength of minorities whose just rights might be imperilled. In short, while he would vote for a residential franchise and the abolition of the forty-shilling freeholder, if he felt certain that Redistribution would recognise the system of proportional representation, he would jealously retain the freehold franchise if Redistribution were to be on the basis of pure majority representation."

A manifesto couched in such explicit language, and coming from such a quarter, was naturally interpreted to mean the formation of a "Cave of Adullam," after the model of the Whig Seceders from Lord Russell's Reform Bill of 1866, who had earned this title from Mr. Bright. But even in the northern counties this Secession was viewed with scant favour, for Mr. Storey, in the neighbouring town of Sunderland, carried his audience with him when he declared for the abolition of the forty-shilling freeholder, except when coupled with residence, and in that the elector should have the right to vote for the county or borough in which he resided, provided that no property entitled the owner to more than one vote.

Meanwhile, on the part of the more responsible members of the Liberal party, the reticence as to the intentions of the Government with reference to home affairs was complete, and even Mr. Gladstone, when speaking to his tenants at Hawarden (January 9), seemed studiously to avoid political questions—home as much as foreign—limiting himself to a discussion of the

causes of the prolonged crisis in agriculture, and urging upon his hearers the economic benefits of jam, both for the cottager producer and for the artisan consumer. Taking a hopeful view of the present and future condition of agriculture, he insisted that if English farmers would enter into competition with the Continental producers, as producers of articles of general consumption, such as poultry, eggs, butter, fruit, &c., they had a boundless field in the ever-increasing demands of home consumption.

A few days later (January 15) Mr. Chamberlain at Newcastle treated rather in an apologetic than in a polemic tone the various questions which the Ministry had to face, and the way in which they had been met. He declared that the Government would leave neither Ireland nor Egypt to become a prey to anarchy; and that as there was already hopeful signs that their policy in the former country was bearing fruit, in spite of the insults heaped upon Lord Spencer and Mr. Trevelyan by the Irish leaders, so in the valley of the Nile, he believed, that a steady adherence to a fixed policy would ultimately be rewarded. In spite of all drawbacks and delays, such as the outbreak of cholera, the breakdown of the Egyptian administration, and the defeat of Egyptian forces in the Soudan, for none of which the English Government was responsible, Mr. Chamberlain maintained that its duty was clear—to fulfil the pledges already given of leaving Egypt to the Egyptians so soon as order was re-established, and institutions with some reasonable prospect of stability were created. In the difficulties in Ireland and Egypt, however, he saw nothing which would justify the Government in postponing measures of domestic reform. As to the question of the Franchise, he urged the necessity of pressing it forward, denying that Redistribution need be considered along with that of an extended suffrage. On the following day the President of the Board of Trade, leaving aside party politics, explained to the Tyne-side shipowners and members of the Marine Insurance Association, the intentions of the Government with regard to the great preventible losses of human life at sea. These losses, he asserted, had reached the appalling average of one sailor in every sixty who went to sea. To reduce the proportion of ships lost through unseaworthiness, the Government proposed a twofold remedy. One part, aiming at protecting the lives of citizens, would extend to shipowners the provisions of the Employers' Liability Act; whilst the other, which would need the hearty acquiescence of both shipowners and insurance companies, would, without interfering with the insurance limit of 8*l.* per ton, invalidate policies effected for any amount in excess of the actual value of the loss sustained. In this latter part of his proposal, Mr. Chamberlain professed himself ready to be influenced by the views of the shipping and insurance interests, but on that part of his bill which aimed at the protection of human life, he declared that the Government would make no concession.

Politically the almost simultaneous speeches of Lord Salisbury at Dorchester and Sir Stafford Northcote at Exeter (January 16) were of even greater importance than Mr. Chamberlain's first step in State Socialism. The Conservative leaders were agreed that an extended Franchise should be opposed, not so much on account of its principle, as for its inopportuneness and its application. Had the country been eager for a new Reform Bill the Ministry would and should have introduced it sooner. The result, moreover, of the measure, if unaccompanied by a Redistribution Bill, would be to aggravate the disabilities under which dwellers in county districts already laboured; for without some modification of the existing boundaries, not only would the towns possess an unfair preponderance over the county, but the urban population would swamp county interests, which had as full a right to be represented as those of towns. Lord Salisbury further protested strongly against the dangers likely to be provoked in Ireland by an extended franchise. An arm of which our Parliamentary Government possessed no armour thick enough to repel the blows would be placed in the hands of the disaffected of that country. "We were," he added, "on an incline plane leading from the position of Lord Hartington to that of Mr. Chamberlain, and so on to the depths over which Mr. Henry George (the author of the 'Land for the People,' and an open advocate of Socialism) rules supreme." For these reasons Lord Salisbury warned his audience that the Franchise Bill would be strenuously opposed, and expressed his belief that "it would not pass this year." Sir Charles Dilke at Kensington (January 22) and Mr. Shaw-Lefevre at Manchester (January 23) took up the cause of the Government. The former arguing that the fortuitous shifting of 3,000 votes from the Conservative to the Liberal side, to which Lord Salisbury attributed the "Liberal reaction of 1880," could only be rendered impossible by the creation of larger constituencies. With regard to the work of the Session, it would be impossible to deal fairly with the question of Redistribution until the registers on the basis of the new Franchise had been made; but he declared that there need be no lack of time for passing the Franchise Bill, and the Municipal Government of London Bill, and that the latter would probably be passed by the House of Lords, whilst the former would be thrown out. Mr. Shaw-Lefevre developed this idea by sketching the principles on which he thought a Redistribution Bill should be based. He suggested the addition of eighteen more members for London, and twenty-two more to Yorkshire and Lancashire. To obtain these, fifty or sixty seats would have to be taken from the smallest boroughs, whilst other boroughs not so small should be grouped or their boundaries extended till the minimum population of 20,000 should be reached. The new members for London and the North, he suggested, should sit for electoral districts, as nearly equal in size and population as possible, each new district being represented by a single member. In the existing historical

constituencies already represented by two members, and requiring neither absorption, extinction, nor extension, he did not expect that the new system would be introduced; and he earnestly argued in favour of an absolute assimilation of the Irish to the English Franchise.

It was at Dublin (January 24) itself that Mr. W. H. Smith undertook to reply to these suggestions, opposing any extension of the suffrage on the ground that it must be extended to Ireland, where it would entail "confiscation of property, ruin of industry, withdrawal of capital—misery, wretchedness, and war." To the Irish electors, numbering 228,000, and living chiefly in farm-houses, would be suddenly added 425,120 electors living for the most part in mud cabins, who would impose their will upon the country. He would therefore postpone the reduction of the Franchise until the supremacy of the law had been vindicated, and Ireland had been educated. To this argument Mr. Chamberlain had an opportunity of replying at Birmingham (January 29), and the confidence with which he was able to speak as to the intentions of the Government was a remarkable instance of the growth of public opinion. Towards the close of the previous Session, not only were rumours rife of a Whig "cave," but Liberal organs like the *Scotsman* declared that a Government composed of reasonable men would shrink from the folly involved in a proposal to exclude redistribution from, and to include Ireland in, this promised Reform Bill. In two months the objections with which Lord Hartington and his friends in the Cabinet were freely credited must have disappeared, for Mr. Chamberlain was able to assert that there was hardly one dissentient voice among the Liberals to the inclusion of Ireland; and that their leader's views had been endorsed by all his colleagues.

Mr. Bright's speech on the same occasion dealt rather with the general attitude of the two political parties on the subject, and displayed much of the bitterness and animosity towards his opponents which had characterised the speeches of his younger days. He referred to many Conservative speeches during the recess as extravagant and virulent attacks upon the Government, the virulence being the greater the higher in society the grade of the speakers, so that when they who spoke were brothers and sons of dukes, their language was the most coarse and ungentlemanly of all. With the view of showing that the Conservatives were undeserving the confidence of the nation, he argued that they were still as antagonistic to the rights of the people as they were when they opposed the abolition of the corn laws and the paper duty, and tried to prevent a treaty of commerce with France, and an extension of the franchise. What were they saying of the promised Franchise Bill for the counties he asked: "They do not all of them declare boldly against it, which I believe they would if they dared, but they actually ask you to produce something that they may accept with it, or consider with it,

which they hate infinitely more than they hate the Franchise Bill itself. And they think that the Government will be so simple and so incompetent to deal with a great question in a manner which would make it almost impossible to succeed with them. But at this moment you have not from any of the gentlemen who have been discussing this question—from Lord Salisbury, or from Sir Stafford Northcote, down to the very lowest of their speakers and orators, you have no promises whatsoever of anything that they will do for the country, for the great masses of the people, if by any accident they should be returned to power. No; I say that they give no promise of penitence or amendment, and as long as they are in that frame of mind, as long as their conduct is marked by the spirit which marks their past, I entreat of the working men of England, especially if they have any regard for their own order, and any regard for their just claims upon a just Government for just legislation, that they should make up their minds in every constituency of the kingdom, if it be possible, to determine for ever that the party that has so injured them and insulted them in the past should be for ever, while unchanged and impenitent, excluded from power."

But a far more interesting and in all respects more powerful speech was delivered by Mr. Bright on the following day, when he exposed the fallacies which underlay Mr. Henry George's theory of nationalising the land, the outcome of which, if logically applied, would be to make the Chancellor of the Exchequer the sole landowner. To accept such a scheme, the people of England, he declared, must have lost not only all their common sense, but all reverence for the Ten Commandments. He maintained that if the sale of land were only free, that is, liberated from the laws of primogeniture and settlement intended to agglomerate estates, the forces of dispersion, the principal of which is the desire for larger interest, would beat the forces of accumulation, and land would again fall into many hands. He would make the transfer of land perfectly simple, just as the transfer of a ship or other exceedingly valuable property is simple, and would in case of intestacy have some law for fair division among children.

It is unnecessary to follow the speeches of the public men who, on the eve of the meeting of Parliament, deemed it expedient to express their opinions and forecast the future in public meetings throughout the country. The keynote was sounded by the leaders, and with more or less variation the refrain was repeated on every platform; the Liberals insisting upon keeping redistribution separate from the franchise question; the Conservatives declaring that unless the two were presented together they would be unable to judge fairly of the extent and operation of the concession they were prepared to make. Even Mr. Goschen, who on the county suffrage question had consistently held views opposed to the majority of his party, speaking to his constituents at Ripon (January 30), admitted that the question of the franchise was practically settled.

The expectation of one and a half or two million voters had been raised; promises had been made by the whole of the Liberal party, and the Opposition had not pronounced against the lowering of the franchise, and while every man maintained his own opinion, the question was settled, and the Opposition would not vote on the simple question of lowering the franchise. He hoped that the Government would take the House of Commons into its confidence early in the Session, and tell them what they meant to do with Redistribution. If their legislation was such as he could support, and he saw that guarantees could be given to avoid dangers, her Majesty's Government need fear no worrying opposition from him on the subject of lowering the franchise. He should waste no time in flogging a dead horse, but he wanted some pledge that the Redistribution of Seats Bill should be fairly applied to Ireland before giving Mr. Parnell the advantages of the Franchise Bill. With regard to the principles of Redistribution he expressed his wish to preserve, as far as was fair and possible, the historical unity of existing Parliamentary boroughs; but in other respects he leaned towards Mr. Forster's views; and altogether objected to the election of several members for one constituency by a simple majority. Mr. Forster's views had been explained a few days previously on assuming the chairmanship of the National Reform Union, at Manchester (January 26). He hoped that boroughs not populous enough to have a separate member under the new scheme, would not be thrown into the counties, but would be enlarged by the inclusion of the surrounding rural district; and that the extra representation of great boroughs would be provided by subdividing them after the manner in which London was already treated.

The tactics of the Conservative party in the coming Session were, however, more definitely put before the world in the *Quarterly Review* (January number) than in any of the speeches of the party leaders. According to the writer, the danger of extending household franchise to Ireland was only less than the impolicy of effecting so vast a change in England and Scotland, and withholding it from Ireland. If, therefore, the efforts of the Conservatives to defeat the Bill in the House of Commons were unavailing, the Lords were exhorted to exercise summarily the power they possessed. A similar treatment was to be applied to the London Government Bill, and to the County Government Bill, except so far as it proposed to lighten the burden of local taxation. Not content with rendering nugatory the decisions of the Commons, the Lords were urged to initiate legislation by giving effect to Mr. Chaplin's resolution of the previous Session relative to the "stamping-out" of foot-and-mouth disease; to insist upon the appointment of a Commission to improve the dwellings of the poor in large cities; and, finally, to consider how far the imposition of some retaliatory tariff might bring back prosperity to the cotton trade. In conclusion the *Quarterly Review* appealed to its party in the House of Lords to act as their predecessors had acted in 1831, to throw out the Reform Bill, and to force on a dissolution in order that as at

that time the Crown, before taking any irrevocable step, might ascertain the sense of the people in the way in which it could be most constitutionally expressed on the expediency of the proposed change.

Whilst public men of all shades of political opinion were endeavouring, with but partial success, to stimulate an interest in the coming Reform Bill, the newspapers were equally persistent in their efforts to awaken their readers to the importance of the Egyptian question. The "advice" given to the Khedive at the beginning of the year to withdraw his garrisons from Khartoum, and the four other strongholds where the Egyptian troops maintained the semblance of authority, was followed by the resignation of the Egyptian Ministry; and the Khedive by accepting it, and appointing in their room men prepared to carry out the English programme, practically placed himself under English protection. The Government, however, although forced to take a more active part in the Egyptian policy, still refused to assume the administration of Egyptian affairs in spite of the pressure of many of its own supporters. Sir Evelyn Baring, who represented the English Government at Cairo, at once grasped the difficulties of the situation, which were but thinly disguised by Nubar Pasha's apparent acquiescence in a policy which found no real support in Egyptian feeling. The English representative had from the first to show that, although his Government limited itself to offering advice, it clearly intended that its advice should be followed; and in deciding that, for political, military, or economic reasons, the Soudan should be abandoned, it was clear that English rather than Egyptian interests had been first regarded. In England the step was criticised adversely as coming too late, and as additional evidence of the tendency of the Government to minimise or ignore future difficulties; to palter with the serious dangers of the present in the hope that some unforeseen stroke of luck would diminish subsequent responsibilities, and ward off inevitable expenditure. This hesitation was painfully conspicuous in their attitude to General Gordon. That remarkable soldier of fortune, whose career in China and the Soudan had marked him out as one specially qualified to deal with the unknown force, religious and material, wielded by the Mahdi, was allowed to involve himself in an engagement with the King of the Belgians to go to the Congo, and was suspended from his position in the British army. He was on the point of starting when at the last moment he was summoned by the Cabinet to advise upon the course to be taken in Egypt. It is not improbable that the acceptance of General Gordon's services in compliance with popular demand was scarcely to the taste or in accordance with the views of some members of the Ministry; but it is only fair to add that when once his employment was agreed to there was little or no dispute as to the terms of the bargain. From the outset Gordon declared the withdrawal of the Khartoum garrison and the Christian population—numbering upwards of 6,000 per-

sons—was an impossibility in the face of the hostile attitude of the intervening tribes. He urged that the only feasible plan was to abandon Western Soudan and the provinces of Darfur and Kordofan, but to hold Khartoum with the provinces lying between the White Nile and the Red Sea, north of Sennaar. Sir Samuel Baker, an almost equal authority on Central African affairs, expressed very similar views, but the warnings and advice of these experts were at first received with ill-disguised impatience by even such organs as the *Times* and the *Daily News*, which preferred to rely upon the insight and judgment of Sir Evelyn Baring and Lord Granville. But, as in the question of the abandonment of the Soudan, so in the employment of General Gordon, the Government showed a marked readiness to follow the change of public opinion. By the middle of January it was recognised that the seaboard from Massowah to Suakim, and inland as far as the White Nile, should be held against the Mahdi and the wild tribes of the Soudan; and following thereupon (January 18) it was announced that the Government had availed itself of General Gordon's services, and on his own terms. In the evening of the same day he left London for Khartoum. His terms were, that he should be absolutely independent of the Khedive, and should receive his orders from the English Government alone. The *Daily News* at once justified the direct interference thus again thrust upon the Government at home by the plea that this country had, in the eyes of the world, some responsibility, not indeed for the state of affairs in the Soudan, but for the measures taken for the relief of the Egyptian garrisons. The Conservative journals were especially unanimous in congratulating the Government on the decision it had taken, and this feeling of approbation found a general echo amongst the organs of both parties throughout the kingdom.

In their public speeches the supporters of the Government were naturally under greater difficulties in approaching the Egyptian question than were members of the Opposition. Thus the Solicitor-General, speaking at Gateshead (January 10), defended the abandonment of the Soudan as the best course open, and declared that the success of the policy of the Government had been due to the desire which had also been felt by Mr. Gladstone to maintain the concert of Europe in order to preserve peace. Sir Wilfrid Lawson, at Maryport, however, more consistent in his views and untrammelled by office, denounced the Egyptian war as a violation of international and moral law, and asserted that it was a burning disgrace to this country that British troops should be employed in the Soudan. On the following day Sir Richard Cross at Hull, and again at Bootle (January 14), declared that the only answer vouchsafed by the Government to the "bitter cry" for help which came from Egypt was a proposal to make a new scientific frontier, which would leave the seaboard of the Soudan open to a revival of the slave trade which had previously existed there. He warned the

Government that they were bound in honour to carry out their pledges to maintain the position of the Khedive and to secure the rights of the fellaheen. The defeat of Hicks Pasha was a turning point in the history of the country, and if we wished to succeed we must speak out boldly and determinedly.

To these and similar reproaches Mr. Chamberlain replied in his speech at Newcastle (January 15), to which reference has already been made. He declined to pay attention to advice about Egyptian affairs coming from such quarters, foreseeing that by so doing the temporary difficulties the Government was called upon to face would soon become permanent dangers. "These unforeseen events," he continued, "may have delayed the execution of our policy, but they have not proved it to be in itself unwise or impossible. . . . The duty of the Government is clear. We have assumed a duty which we cannot neglect—we have set our hands to the plough and we must not go back. We cannot leave Egypt to anarchy, but on the other hand we do not and we ought not to withdraw any of the assurances we have given. The task is likely to be more difficult than we supposed. It will take a longer time than we anticipated. There is nothing which has happened that makes me think that it will not ultimately with time and patience and discretion succeed, and be completely accomplished."

Sir Charles Dilke was the first Cabinet Member to speak in public (January 22) after the acceptance of General Gordon's services. Explaining to his constituents at Kensington the reasons which had influenced the Government in their course, he spoke as follows: "General Gordon is not against but in favour of the policy of the evacuation of Darfur, Kordofan, and the interior of the Soudan. The greater part of what is called the Soudan is not, and never has been, an integral part of Egypt. The Egyptian is a foreigner there. The Soudan has always been a strain and a drain upon Egypt, and instead of being a help, these countries always have been, in our opinion, a weakness to it, and if they be a weakness to Egypt, it would be simple madness to this country to insist upon their retention. We have no interest that the Egyptians rather than the Sultans of Darfur should rule in Darfur; our interest is that there should be peace in the country. We have, I think, an interest that the Egyptian rule should be maintained on the coasts of the Red Sea, but we have no interest whatever in upholding Egyptian rule in the interior of the continent of Africa. The Conservatives have told us that we have shown upon this subject a singularly vacillating policy, and they seem to think we were suddenly driven to the employment of General Gordon at a day's notice by the news we got in the Conservative press. We first suggested the sending out of General Gordon to the late Egyptian Government very many months ago, but at that time the suggestion was not received with favour, either by the Egyptian Government or by our own representatives in Cairo. They thought that, under the circumstances then existing, it would not be desirable

of the attempt to preserve the Soudan for the Egyptians, and the uselessness of the native army so carefully trained after Sir Evelyn Wood's method; suggesting at the same time the not improbable inefficiency of the other European institutions we were attempting to naturalise on Egyptian soil. The Speech ran as follows:—

“ My Lords and Gentlemen,

“ I have called you together for the Fifth Session of this Parliament, that you may again address yourselves to the discharge of your arduous and ever-growing duties.

“ I continue to hold friendly and harmonious relations with all foreign Powers.

“ My communications with the President of the French Republic, arising out of special incidents in Madagascar, have closed, as I had anticipated, in a manner such as tends to confirm the cordial understanding between the two countries.

“ I have likewise, in conjunction with the President, appointed a Commission, which is now sitting in Paris, to discuss a basis of arrangement, which I had proposed, for the future regulation of the Newfoundland fisheries and the avoidance of disputes.

“ An agreement has been arrived at with Portugal respecting the River Congo and the adjacent territories. This agreement will be presented to you forthwith.

“ Arrangements are in progress for the resumption of diplomatic relations with Mexico, and special envoys have been despatched by each Government to promote that end.

“ Negotiations for a treaty of commerce with Turkey have commenced; an agreement on commercial arrangements with Spain has been signed, which awaits the sanction of the Cortes; a revision of the commercial treaty with Japan, on a basis generally agreed to by the Treaty Powers, is nearly completed; and a treaty of commerce and friendship has likewise been signed with Corea.

“ Having had every reason to be satisfied with the tranquillity of Egypt, and with the progress made in the establishment of orderly institutions, I gave, during the autumn, instructions for the evacuation of Cairo, for the further reduction of my military forces, and for their concentration mainly in Alexandria.

“ But in the month of November the Egyptian army, appointed to maintain the rule of the Khedive in the Soudan, was defeated and broken up with heavy loss.

“ Upon the occurrence of this defeat, I deemed it wise to recall the order I had given, as a precaution against the possible effects of the military reverse in Egypt itself, and to preclude all doubt as to the certain maintenance of its tranquillity.

“ While an unforeseen and calamitous necessity has thus required me to suspend the measure I had adopted, the aim of my occupation, which has been explained to you at former times, continues without change.

“ I have offered to the Egyptian Government such counsels as

appeared to be required by a prudent regard to the amount of its resources, and to the social condition of the country. I have also despatched Major-General Gordon to report on the best means of giving effect to the resolution of the Khedive to withdraw from the interior of the Soudan, and have permitted him to act in the execution of the measure.

"Papers relating to this and to several of the foregoing subjects will be presented to you.

"I have directed communications to be held with the Delegates whom the Government of the Transvaal has sent to this country for the purpose of urging a reconsideration of the Convention of Pretoria.

"In this interchange of views, attention has been principally turned to the question, always one of difficulty in South Africa, how best to make provision for the maintenance of order, and the prevention of oppression, on the frontier.

"Nothing has occurred to discourage the expectation that these communications may be brought to a favourable issue.

"Papers will be presented to you on the subject in due course; and likewise with respect to the condition of Zululand, which continues to be unsettled; as well as to the resumption of direct Imperial authority in Basutoland, which is in immediate contemplation.

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons,

"The Estimates of charge for the public services during the year 1884-85 have been prepared, and will speedily be laid before you.

"I anticipate that the Revenue of the current year will not fall short of the expectations upon which you founded your financial arrangements.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,

"The condition of Ireland continues to exhibit those features of substantial improvement which I described on the two occasions when I last addressed you.

"A measure will at once be presented to you which will have for its principal object the enlargement of the occupation franchise in parliamentary elections throughout the United Kingdom. The experience, gained during half a century by the progressive admission of augmented numbers to a share in our representative system, happily warrants the belief that again, as heretofore, the result of a judicious extension of the franchise will be a still closer attachment of the nation to the Throne, the law, and the institutions of the country.

"I anticipate a like effect from the extension and the reform of local government.

"This comprehensive subject embraces all that relates locally to the greater efficiency of administration, to the alleviation of burdens by improved arrangements, and to the enlargement of the powers of ratepayers through the representative system,

including among them the regulation of the traffic in intoxicating liquors.

“A plan will be laid before you for the extension of Municipal Government to the whole Metropolis.

“The preparation under this head, however, which has been made by my directions, has not been limited to London; but the actual presentation of further Bills of the same class must depend upon the progress you may be enabled to make with the weighty business which has been already set forth.

“Other public wants have not been neglected; and you will be invited to consider Bills relating to the Security of Life and Property at Sea, to the Railway Commission and its powers, and to the repression of Corrupt Practices at Municipal Elections.

“Measures will likewise be laid before you for the better administration of Scottish business; for the promotion of education, and for the closing of public-houses on Sunday in Ireland; and also for the improvement of intermediate education in Wales.

“I humbly commend your efforts in the matters I have named to you, and in all other particulars, to the blessing of Almighty God.”

Although it had been known beforehand that an amendment to the address on Egyptian affairs would be moved by the Opposition in the House of Commons, no common line of action in the two Houses was adopted. In the Lords, the Address having been briefly moved by the Marquess of Tweeddale and seconded by Lord Vernon, the Marquess of Salisbury at once rose to explain that it was not in accordance with the traditions of the Upper House to challenge the conduct of the Government in that way. He was, however, far from sharing the hopeful views expressed by the Ministry in the speech from the throne, and ridiculed the plea they put forward, that others—and not they themselves—were responsible for the disasters which had occurred and the confusion which prevailed throughout Egypt. Her Majesty's Government, he said, had proved themselves experts in “scuttling out,” and were therefore competent advisers of Egypt in such a movement. He ridiculed the idea of sending a man of action who was accustomed to “strike hard” to perform the function which would devolve on Major-General Gordon, and he held it was unnecessary to endanger the life of so distinguished a man in an operation which could reflect no credit upon the Government by which it was undertaken. Lastly, he denied the right of the Khedive, even on the advice of England, to surrender territory in the Soudan without the leave of the Sultan and the consent of the Powers which had guaranteed the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, and he expressed doubt that without a firman from the Sultan the Messrs. Rothschild would have security for their loan to Egypt. The Government, he maintained, were using language of two meanings, but their attitude of two faces was not deluding the Powers of Europe into the belief that England would let go her

grasp on Egypt, but was leading to the belief in Egypt that England was not able to do what she ought to do. With regard to the proposed extension of the franchise, Lord Salisbury said that experience did not suggest the hope that it would strengthen the attachment of Irishmen to the throne; and, with reference to the passage in the speech on the condition of Ireland, he observed that in proportion to the growth of the organisation for the separation of Ireland from England, and for the setting of class against class in Ireland itself, so rose the assurances of the Government that their Irish measures were bearing good fruit. In conclusion, he expressed his conviction that nothing would contribute more to the passing of good measures than their being submitted to that House early enough to obtain for them careful consideration.

Lord Granville limited himself almost entirely to a defence of the Government policy in Egypt. After twitting Lord Salisbury with having failed to answer Mr. Goschen's charge that his lordship was most responsible for the difficulties which had arisen in Egypt, he maintained that throughout that country security of life and property had never for years been so complete as then. As for the Soudan, he declared that General Gordon's opinion was that it would be an iniquity to reconquer it for Egypt, unless we could secure for it an efficient administration, which could be done only at an enormous expense. The question was not one of surrender of territory, but one of withdrawing troops from a country in which they could not remain unless it were reconquered, and he was not aware that the Sultan was disposed to advance money to reconquer the Soudan. As to the security for the loan, he thought the Messrs. Rothschild might safely be left to judge for themselves in the matter. He had no policy to announce in respect of Egypt. All he had to say in answer to the demands of Lord Salisbury on that point was that Her Majesty's Government would adhere to the policy they had already announced to Parliament and to the world.

The Address was then agreed to without a division, but before adjourning the Duke of Richmond brought in a Bill, framed on the lines of Mr. Chaplin's resolution of the previous Session, to amend the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act of 1878, which, it was maintained, pressed with unfair weight upon the farmers and breeders of stock.

In the House of Commons, at the opening of the sitting, Mr. Gladstone, amid loud cheers from the Ministerial benches, gave notice that on the first available day he would move for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the law relating to the representation of the people of the United Kingdom; and also that on the same day he would move the reappointment of the Standing Committees. Mr. Chamberlain also gave notice of a Bill for providing greater security for life and property at sea; Sir C. Dilke of one for extending the hours of polling; and the Attorney-General of Bills for extending the Corrupt Practices Act to municipal elections, and

for enabling accused persons to give evidence. Sir J. M'Garel Hogg, moreover, gave notice of a Bill for the water supply of the metropolis; whilst close upon 120 Bills were promised by private members.

The Address in reply to the Queen's Speech was moved by the Hon. A. Elliot, member for Roxburghshire, and seconded by Mr. S. Smith, member for Liverpool, who expressed his satisfaction that municipal government and the cause of temperance were going to be taken in hand by the Government. Mr. Bourke then at once rose to move his amendment (of which notice had been given), directing Her Majesty's attention to the want of success which had so far attended the attempts of Ministers to place the affairs of Egypt on a sound footing, either as regarded the reconstruction of the Government, the reorganisation of justice and a satisfactory adjustment of its finances, or the tranquillity and security of its frontier provinces. He further submitted that the course which the Government had pursued had tended to weaken the authority of the native government without providing any adequate substitute, and that such a course was fraught with danger to Egypt, and tended indefinitely to postpone the establishment of a state of things in which the withdrawal of Her Majesty's forces would be possible, while it dangerously increased the responsibility and liabilities of this country, both towards Egypt itself and the Powers of Europe. His amendment then went on to express the opinion of the House that no measures would be effective for attaining the object of the Ministerial policy in Egypt, and providing for the security of that country, unless they were founded on a distinct recognition by Her Majesty's Ministers of the obligations they had incurred by their intervention in the administration of Egyptian affairs. After a rapid and brilliant sketch of the course of events since the close of hostilities against Arabi, Mr. Bourke drew a graphic picture of the present deadlock in Egypt, contending that we had set up an artificial system in the country which could not be worked by native officials and which had made no progress in giving the people what they desired—relief from the burdens of debt and taxation, protection against cruelty and corruption, and security for life and property. Commenting on the crisis in the Soudan, he severely censured the Government for sanctioning General Baker's expedition, and asked for some explanation of the delay in sending out General Gordon, and also as to the position which he occupied in regard to the British Government. The abandonment of the Soudan and its garrisons he maintained entailed immense responsibilities on the British Government, and serious expense to Egypt, and anarchy and bloodshed in the Soudan.

The amendment was briefly seconded by the Baron de Worms, who traced the confusion in Egypt to the discordant counsels of the Cabinet, and a discussion, which it was anticipated would occupy at least three nights, was launched upon the House. But when

Baron de Worms sat down the House was almost empty, and Sir Charles Dilke, who had been deputed to reply to Mr. Bourke's strictures, apparently relying upon some unwritten code of etiquette which precludes a Cabinet Minister from speaking during the dinner hours (8 P.M. to 10 P.M.), and no one rising to continue the debate, the Speaker put the question. Mr. Bourke's amendment thereupon, without any clue to the answer of the Government to the charges brought against it, was promptly negatived by 77 to 20 votes. As might have been anticipated, this sudden conclusion did not in any way tend to expedite business or to soften the asperities of party strife. Mr. Stanhope, in seconding Mr. A. J. Balfour's motion for the adjournment of the debate, denounced the Government for seeking to evade Parliamentary criticism and to shirk the direct challenge which had been thrown out to them. It was in vain that Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues protested that they were as much taken by surprise by the collapse of the debate as their opponents, and it was not until an assurance was given that the whole question should be debated on the report of the Address, that the matter was allowed to drop, and the House adjourned.

On the following day, however, the subject was again brought forward, provoking many "scenes," and occupying a considerable portion of the sitting. Soon after the House assembled (February 6) Lord Randolph Churchill proposed to move the adjournment of the House, with the view of calling attention "to a matter of definite public importance"—viz. the refusal of the Government to continue the debate on Mr. Bourke's amendment. Being asked, in the terms of the Standing Order, whether his request was supported by forty members, the whole of the Conservative party present, including the front Opposition bench, stood up, and Lord R. Churchill thereupon proceeded to condemn in strong language the conduct of the Government, and of Sir C. Dilke in particular, whose refusal to speak in the dinner hour, he insisted, was a departure from the invariable practice when a vote of censure had been moved. He declined altogether to regard the collapse as accidental, and stigmatised it as a degradation of the House, and a reduction of the debate to a perfect farce.

The motion for adjournment was seconded by Mr. Chaplin, who reminded the House that this was not the first time that the Government had allowed an important debate to collapse, as exactly the same thing had happened on the second reading of the Irish Land Bill of 1881.

Mr. Gladstone replied that there was no foundation for these charges, and declined therefore to notice them. Nobody regretted, he said, the summary close of the debate more than the Government, who desired earnestly to show where was the origin and nature of the Egyptian difficulty; but as far as the House was concerned, it would resume the discussion with greater advantage, because it would have before it all the information in the papers

just distributed to members. He denied that it was incumbent on a Government attacked by a vote of censure to put up their champion immediately, if the occasion occurred at dinner hour; but in this case, if he had been in the House at the moment, Sir C. Dilke would have risen rather than allow the debate to fall through as it did. As to the Under-Secretary, he had refrained from taking part in the debate by previous agreement.

Sir S. Northcote thought the Prime Minister's explanation unsatisfactory. Whether it was convenient for Sir C. Dilke or Lord E. Fitzmaurice to speak in the dinner hour or not, it was the duty of the Government to have made provision for continuing the debate. The collapse was a violation of the positive arrangement made with the Opposition that Sir C. Dilke would follow Mr. Bourke, and it was entirely unworthy of a Government directly challenged on a material portion of its policy.

After some further remarks from independent members on the uses of the "dinner hour," and the part which it played in advancing legislation, the motion for the adjournment was negatived, and in a listless and almost empty House, the Lord Mayor (Mr. R. N. Fowler) provoked discussion on the condition of affairs in South Africa, which showed that both parties in the House of Commons were practically agreed upon many points. By implication, if not in words, Mr. Evelyn Ashley, on behalf of the Government, admitted that the restoration of Cetewayo had been a failure. The Zulu Chief had disregarded the conditions to which he had freely assented when in captivity, and consequently the Government would not replace him in his original position, nor admit him to the Reserved Territory, except as a refugee. Mr. Chamberlain further admitted that Cetewayo's presence so near the frontier of Zululand constituted a difficulty and a danger which called for immediate attention.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach admitted that our position in South Africa was too difficult and complicated to be treated in a party spirit. He agreed with the Lord Mayor in entertaining a poor opinion of the fidelity of the Boers to their engagements, and Sir Henry Holland carried his distrust so far as to make the somewhat unusual request that the Government should announce its determination to go to war with the Transvaal in case the agreement now under discussion was not loyally adhered to. Mr. Forster was not prepared to take quite so harsh a view of the Boers, but at the same time admitted that they required careful watching. Mr. Chamberlain was naturally reluctant to assume that people with whom the Government had been negotiating for the last three months could not be trusted to carry out the agreements that might be arrived at. He pointed out, however, that the substantial breaches of faith alleged against the Boers had not been satisfactorily proved and were strenuously denied by the Transvaal Government; that disorderly persons and marauders of all kinds had done a great deal of mischief was beyond doubt; but the

Boers affirmed, and with great plausibility, that these freebooters came from all parts of South Africa. They declared further, that they had done everything in their power to put down freebooting from the Transvaal, and that if they had failed the reason lay in the extreme difficulty of exerting effective control over a great extent of unsettled country. Mr. Chamberlain at the same time defended the restoration of Cetewayo, though he admitted it had failed in its object, little anticipating that within eight-and-forty hours the stumbling-block of which he was speaking would be for ever removed out of the way of the Government. As to the negotiations of the Boers, he maintained that in that direction steady progress was being made, as was to be seen in the assent of both Boers and the Cape Government to the appointment of a President; and he looked to the border police for a protection of the trade route from marauders, as well as of the natives from unfair and harsh treatment. The general outcome of the debate seemed to show that Lord Derby's negotiations had not been altogether unproductive of results, and the way was being paved for a calmer discussion with the Boers and the Cape Parliament of the still unsettled suzerainty question.

The third night's debate on the Address was devoted to home affairs, Mr. Chaplin moving as an amendment that precedence over all other measures should be given to the Bill restricting the movement of infected cattle. The promise of the Government to legislate in the matter made the debate somewhat a hollow one; and Mr. Mundella endeavoured to prove that the resolution against which he and his colleagues had struggled so keenly in the previous year was in fact useless, inasmuch as there was no case of the dissemination of disease by imported cattle. The Conservatives, however, argued that the Privy Council should be provided with powers to stop the movement of cattle at any moment, this power not being conferred upon the Executive by the Act of 1878. The Irish Members introduced a plea that special facilities should be given to the importation of Irish cattle; but, owing to the strongly expressed belief that much disease was attributable to such animals, the point was dropped, and eventually the discussion was narrowed as to when legislation should take place. The Government, knowing the demand upon the time at their disposal, wished to be allowed to choose a favourable moment. Mr. Chaplin desired immediate legislation, and on a division he was beaten by 251 to 200.

Meanwhile, notice had been given in both Houses of a Vote of Censure on the Government policy in Egypt, describing it as vacillating and inconsistent. That there was throughout the country a growing feeling that the moment had arrived to adopt some definite course with regard to the pacification of Egypt can hardly be doubted. Putting aside London, the provincial organs which generally supported the Government were loud in their appeals that steps should be taken to insure the safety of General Gordon. The story of his solitary ride through the desert, the

rumour of his falling a prisoner into the hands of his enemies, and his subsequent triumphant entry into Khartoum, touched the popular mind, but little accustomed to contemporary knight-errantry. Added to this, the reticence of the Government, and its apparent shrinking from any step which might lead to future responsibilities, were incentives enough to less adventurous leaders than Lord Salisbury to make a reconnaissance in force of his adversary's position. It was therefore agreed, that after a night devoted to the discussion of Irish affairs, the debate on the Address should be suspended, in order that the Vote of Censure should at once be debated and the policy of the Ministry put to the test. The Irish discussion turned chiefly upon the recent Orange and Nationalist demonstrations in Ulster, although Mr. Parnell's amendment complained that "the exercise of free speech had been practically extinguished in the country." In support of his charge he referred to various public meetings which had been prohibited, but with curious logic he then went on to complain of the immunities enjoyed by the speakers, chiefly magistrates, and commenced to applaud the conduct of Lord Rossmore for his defiance of the authorities. He further upbraided the Government with having allowed Sir S. Northcote to make a political campaign throughout the North, and complained that whilst Nationalist members were imprisoned for the slightest excess of language, the Crimes Act had never been put in force against any Orangemen, notwithstanding the violent threats and gross slanders in which speakers at Orange meetings indulged. Home Rule members like Mr. Sullivan and Mr. O'Brien followed in the same strain, the latter accusing the Government of cringing to the Orange party, and denying vehemently that there was any substantial improvement in the condition of Ireland. The Orange members warmly defended the conduct of Lord Rossmore, who, as they asserted, had been dismissed from the magistracy without any proper inquiry, and Lord Crichton's account of the affair at Rosslea tended to show that, although Lord Rossmore might technically have been in error in refusing to obey the resident magistrate, yet by his conduct he had secured the only chance of controlling his followers, and, as the event showed, had led them past the Nationalists without a collision. Lord R. Churchill, desirous perhaps to prove that the rumour of his conversion to the Home Rule party was baseless, commented sarcastically on Mr. Parnell's appearance as the defender of law and order, declared that the Orangemen had learnt the lessons of violent agitation from the Nationalists, and pronounced Lord Rossmore's dismissal as a mere bait thrown out by the Government to catch the Irish vote, and additional evidence that the Kilmainham treaty was still in force. The views of the two front Benches differed more from those of the previous speakers than from one another. Mr. Trevelyan, replying on behalf of the Government, maintained that agrarian and political crime had sunk to a point not discreditable to any

country, that rents were well paid, and that the tone of public meetings had been greatly mitigated. He explained next in detail the principles on which the Irish Government had acted in prohibiting and permitting meetings, and the precautions they had taken to prevent collisions. These prohibitions were only enforced in districts where violence had been common and recent, or where the demonstrations announced promised to be on such a scale that not even 1,200 soldiers could be relied upon to keep order. In spite, however, of all these restrictions, at least five Nationalist meetings had been held for every one prohibited, so that Mr. Parnell's grievance was not, after all, so crying. Passing then to the other side of the question, he complained that the Orange party had not trusted the Executive, but had taken a way of their own to stop the Nationalist meetings, which he maintained might have led to most dangerous consequences. He next went at length into the history of the Rosslea meeting in justification of the dismissal of Lord Rossmore, and he contended that, considering the heated atmosphere in which they had worked, the Government had done its duty efficiently and impartially.

On behalf of the Conservatives, Mr. Gibson bore testimony to the progress of order, though he maintained that if there was an improvement in Ireland it was due to the Crimes Act, for which the Opposition had been more in earnest than the Government, by which it was introduced. What was required in Ireland was time to settle down, and Mr. Gibson complained that the language and the acts of some of the members of the Government were rather calculated to have an unsettling effect and to deter the influx of capital. The action of the Government in regard to the meetings in Ulster had been irregular and uncertain, and discussing the Rosslea case, he asked why Lord Rossmore had been singled out and other magistrates had been passed over. As to the Dromore business, he thought the life which had been lost would have been spared if the Lord-Lieutenant had proclaimed the meeting instead of assembling an army to keep the peace. Knowing how the Land League was composed, it was no wonder that the Loyalists of Ulster should have taken active measures to repel the invasion, and under the present circumstances of Ireland, it was criminal lunacy to discourage the only loyal classes in the country.

At this point (February 8) the discussion was broken off, under the belief that on its reassembling the House (February 14) would at once take up the Vote of Censure, although adjournment of the debate on the Address would have to be formally assented to. On this point the leaders on both sides, and probably the great majority of the members, were agreed, but they had overlooked the chances of Parliamentary warfare, and apparently forgotten Mr. Bradlaugh's intentions, although the "incomplete" member for Northampton had previously communicated with the Conservative leader. In the interval between the rising of the House and its

reassembling, the seemingly inexhaustible Bradlaugh case had presented itself in a fresh light. The Lord Chief Justice (Coleridge) and Mr. Justice Stephen delivered (February 9) the judgment of the Queen's Bench Division in the action of Bradlaugh v. Gosset, for excluding the former from the House by the direction of the speaker. The Court held that the Houses of Parliament had not only absolute command over their own discipline, but the absolute right to interpret for themselves, without appeal, rules of procedure and discipline, as regards all proceedings within the House. The Courts of Justice, however, would claim to interpret for themselves Acts imposing fines and penalties, and would not be bound by any resolutions of the House, except so far as they were in conformity with the law. This decision thus opened up to Mr. Bradlaugh the opportunity, if he could obtain it, of testing the value of a self-administered oath, followed by a vote in Parliament. As soon, therefore, as the questions had been disposed of, Mr. Bradlaugh, accompanied by Mr. Burt and Mr. Labouchere, appeared at the bar, and rapidly advancing towards the table, produced a small book, which afterwards proved to be a New Testament, and a sheet of paper. In the noise of the House, although the Speaker was standing up calling "Order, order," the words of Mr. Bradlaugh's self-administered oath were inaudible, but on concluding them he signed his name and handed the paper to the Clerk at the table. Without delay, the Speaker called upon Mr. Bradlaugh to withdraw while the House considered his conduct in endeavouring to administer the oath to himself without being called on, and without any of the forms prescribed by law.

After a short pause, Sir S. Northcote rose, amid much cheering from the Opposition, and, assuming that the Prime Minister had no intention of taking the initiative, pointed out to the House that the ceremony which Mr. Bradlaugh had gone through was not in accordance with the statute, and moved that, having reference to the resolutions already passed, and the reports of the Committees, Mr. Bradlaugh be not permitted to go through the form of repeating the words of the oath. Mr. Gladstone admitted the consistency of Sir S. Northcote's motion, but still thought that no responsibility rested on the Government to give effect to a decision of which they disapproved. As, however, it might be their duty to direct the Attorney-General to test the legality of Mr. Bradlaugh's conduct by an action at law, he urged the House to accept the motion without a division.

Mr. Labouchere, aware that a division was especially desired by his colleague, opposed this peaceful arrangement. He pointed out that the motion would prevent Mr. Bradlaugh taking his seat, even if the courts of law decided that what he had done was legal, and on that account he must oppose it. He contended that there was nothing either in the statute or the Standing Order requiring administration of the oath, and he protested his entire agreement with Mr. Bradlaugh that the last part

of the oath was unmeaning superstition, as complete trash as any African Mumbo Jumbo.

This and similar language so shocked Mr. O'Donnell that he appealed to the Speaker for protection, but without obtaining much comfort or redress, beyond the conviction that Mr. Labouchere for some very inexplicable reason had considerably damaged the cause of the colleague he had apparently risen to defend. Mr. Forster, who spoke next, showed to what extent religious Liberals had been offended by Mr. Labouchere's remarks, although they were ready to support his suggestion on the ground that the electors of Northampton had a right to send whom they pleased to Parliament, and that to exclude their choice was to strike a blow at religion. After a number of speeches, chiefly from the Conservatives, in favour of the motion, the prospect of its being agreed to seemed imminent; when Mr. O'Donnell directed attention to the fact that Mr. Bradlaugh, although directed to withdraw, still remained in the House. The Speaker explained that he was within his right in taking his seat below the Bar, and that he had no authority to order him to withdraw. This led to further discussion, the Irish members insisting that exclusion to Mr. Bradlaugh should mean the same as exclusion to themselves. In reality, their object was to prevent Mr. Bradlaugh from voting in the division which was about to take place, and it was not until it was seen that Mr. Sexton's motion that Mr. Bradlaugh should withdraw during the division would in itself lead to a division in which Mr. Bradlaugh could take part, that it was withdrawn and Sir S. Northcote's motion was put. But even then there was to be further contention and confusion. Before the numbers were called, Lord Crichton, one of the tellers, reported that Mr. Bradlaugh had voted with the Noes, whereupon Mr. Healy proposed that the vote should be expunged. The tellers had meanwhile remained in their places by the table, not having been able to declare the numbers. Mr. Labouchere, who was the teller for the Noes, returned to his place to oppose Mr. Healy's motion—a course which produced fresh discussion and loud cries. The Speaker, however, ruled that Mr. Labouchere had acted in accordance with the rules of the House: and another division was taken, in which Mr. Bradlaugh again voted, and in both cases in the minority. It, however, at once became clear that, although Mr. Bradlaugh's vote in the first division had been disallowed, yet having voted in the second, his vote would, even if this course were repeated ever so often, be recorded once oftener than it could be disallowed. The tellers were therefore at last allowed to give the results of the first division, when they appeared 167 for Mr. Bradlaugh and 280 against. This was followed shortly by a further proposition by Sir S. Northcote that Mr. Bradlaugh should be excluded from the precincts of the House, which, in spite of a protest from Mr. Bright, was agreed to without a division.

Before coming, however, to the Vote of Censure, Mr. Chaplin

moved the adjournment of the debate, in order to call attention to the refusal of the Government to say whether they intended to take measures for the relief of Sinkat and Tokar. The demand having been supported by more than forty members, a long and acrimonious debate ensued, which resulted in nothing—Mr. Gladstone refusing to give explanations which must of necessity be unsatisfactory, as the Government were still without means of arriving at a matured decision. The consequence, however, of these unforeseen incidents was the postponement of the Vote of Censure, and the resumption for the remainder of the evening of the debate on the Address, and a further discussion on the state of Ireland. But the delay was probably not altogether displeasing to those members of the Cabinet who were credited with the wish for a more energetic foreign policy. By a strange reversal of parties, it was asserted that an active, and if necessary an aggressive, line in Egypt was advocated by the advanced Radicals, whilst the Whig section preferred temporising, and added their weight to those who shrank from the expense which would be entailed by a military campaign. If these rumours had any foundation, the “forward party” did not find themselves without support. A requisition, hastily framed, urging a more direct interference in the affairs of Egypt at once obtained numerous signatures from steady supporters of the Ministry. The memorandum called for an energetic policy in order to re-establish confidence, not only in Egypt, but in Europe; and declared that without it no prospect of settlement, political, commercial, or agricultural, was possible. Whether the knowledge that such a document was in circulation had any influence on the decision of the Cabinet matters but little; but at a council held before the commencement of the debate on the Vote of Censure, it was decided to despatch a force to hold Suakim and relieve Tokar, and General Sir Redvers Buller and his staff left London the same evening for Cairo.

This display of vigour, although stigmatised as coming too late, might have profited the Government in the imminent debate, had not its effect been marred by the announcement made in both Houses soon after their assembling that Sinkat had fallen and the garrison been cut to pieces. On this, Lord Salisbury rose to propose his Vote of Censure, which he reminded his hearers came before them just as the news reached them that the troops of two English Generals and those of one of the most distinguished officers in the Egyptian service had been routed and destroyed. This outcome he traced to the course of conduct adopted by Her Majesty's Government, which had been vacillating and inconsistent. They had adopted three policies in turn. First they accepted the Soudan as an integral part of the Egyptian empire by not attempting to stop the operations there; that was a sound policy at the time. After the departure of Lord Dufferin they went over to a policy of indifference, the policy of the Epicurean gods. Finally, at the beginning of the new year the Government stepped

in with a command to abandon the territory south of Wady Halfa. "We can remember," added Lord Salisbury, "when those who now hold office were very strong on the question of responsibilities. We can remember when they insisted on every platform that those who were then in power were responsible for the acts of the Turkish Government, over which they had no material hold or control whatever. Now, having absolute material hold and control over the action of the Egyptian Government, they try to persuade us that these terrible calamities, which they allowed the Egyptian Government and the gallant defenders of these fortresses to incur, do not involve their own responsibility at all. We can remember another occasion when the honour of England was at stake, and the Government of this country refused to do what every other Government that ever existed would have done—refused to avenge a defeat lest it should involve bloodguiltiness. Is there not bloodguiltiness here? In this resolute renunciation of responsibility—in this abandonment of gallant men to an inevitable doom, in this giving up of 1,000 women and children to all the hideous horrors of an Oriental victory—is there no bloodguiltiness here? My lords, it is on all these things that I ask your verdict. I am told that it is of little avail. Perhaps we may hope to infuse some vigour and some energy where there was none before—to wake the Government to their real responsibilities, to induce them to cast aside the screen of a sham Egyptian responsibility, behind which they are sheltering themselves. But we may not be able to do so. It may not be possible for us to affect the philosophy to which they have pledged themselves and the promises by which they are bound. If it be so—if we cannot induce them to reconsider their course, at least a duty remains for us to perform. They may take refuge behind their constitutional powers. They may shelter themselves behind the Caucus. Weak in argument, but strong in wire-pulling, they may defy the opinion of England and of the civilised world. But at least, my lords, we will discharge our responsibility. We will place on record the convictions of this House, and of that large and influential community whose opinions are reflected here. We will not allow this miserable apathy, this timid repudiation of responsibility, to pass without a protest of indignation. We will, at all events, not be accomplices to this dishonour."

Lord Granville, in rising to defend the Government under the somewhat untoward circumstances which had recently taken place, naturally endeavoured to lead away attention from the higher regions of sentimental oratory to the more practical questions of what had been done during the recess, and what it might have been possible to have done. Taking Mr. Bourke's unanswered speech of the previous week, rather than Lord Salisbury's powerful impeachment, he claimed to find in the former an authoritative statement that the Conservative party was opposed to the annexation of Egypt, and even to the permanent employment of English troops in that country. He then went on to show how far improvements

and reforms in Egypt proper had advanced under English influence, and expressed his belief that a good army and a trustworthy police force were in course of establishment under Sir Evelyn Wood, whilst the troops under Baker Pasha were of a different sort. Turning then to Lord Salisbury's charges, Earl Granville contended that the policy of the Government was open to the charge of obstinacy rather than to that of inconsistency. They had declined to give advice to Egypt as to her action in the Soudan so long as the Egyptians thought they could hold their own there, but when it became mathematically clear that they could not, the Government advised them to abandon the Soudan. General Gordon was sanguine that he would be able to accomplish his mission satisfactorily if time were given him. In a telegram received that day the General said: "I have formed a committee of defence with Hassan Kalifa Pasha; they meet to-day. They have announced my assumption of the supreme power in the Soudan. I hope to conciliate whole province of Berber under my presidency. Question of getting out garrison and families is so interlaced with preservation of well-to-do people of this country as to be for the present inseparable. Any precipitate action separating these interests would throw all well-disposed people into the ranks of the enemy, and would fail utterly in its effects. Therefore, I trust patience will be shown, and that you will not be at all anxious as to issue."

It was, Lord Granville further urged, perfectly impossible that anything could have been done to relieve Sinkat after General Baker's defeat: "We have no obligation whatever to annex or to countenance anything in the nature of annexation. We say, as we have said from the beginning, that it is our intention to withdraw our troops after we have established a stable and permanent Government in Egypt. We have also a responsibility. During that time we have a right to see that our advice on all important questions is followed in Egypt. I will only say one word more. It is utterly impossible to administer the details of Egyptian Government from Downing Street. What we have done is to choose the very best men for that purpose. Having done this, the right principle to pursue is to lay down sound principles by which they are to act, and as long as we have confidence in them, to give them our most ample support."

Lord Cairns, after pointing out that Lord Granville's speech was no answer to Lord Salisbury, argued at length upon the moral responsibility of the Government for the events in the Soudan. Our troops were garrisoned in Egypt, the Administrative Government had been dismissed at our orders, and their successors appointed in compliance with our wishes; whilst our offer of a guarantee for a new loan placed the control of the finances in our power. Foreign Powers had given "a mandate" to England, and might at any time insist upon knowing how the power confided to that country had been employed. The Lord Chancellor (Selborne) took the narrower legal view of our responsibilities, and dissented altogether

from the description of our position in Egypt as given by Lord Cairns: and then went on to develop at some length an argument indicated by Lord Granville, that Hicks Pasha's attempt to reconquer the whole of the Soudan was an experiment which the Cabinet was not justified in forbidding the Egyptian Government to try. He maintained that this country had no interest in the enormous territory, 1,600 miles long by 1,200 broad, vaguely known as the Soudan; that the Soudan in that extended sense was a continual drain upon Egyptian resources. The Government, moreover, knew that the strength of the Mahdi lay in the hope of his followers being able to throw off the yoke of the plunderers quartered on them by Egypt; and, consequently, their relations towards the Khedive and Hicks Pasha became strained to the utmost at a moment when they were especially desirous to uphold the former's authority. Lord Dunraven, speaking from the Liberal side of the House, vigorously attacked the Government, which he held responsible for the blood shed in Egypt and the Soudan, all of which might have been saved, and the Mahdi's power restricted to narrow limits, had Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet declared itself rulers of Egypt. Lord Cranbrook bitterly upbraided the Government with being the cause of all the disasters in the Soudan, and declared that now General Gordon was sent as their scapegoat, but warned them that they had thereby incurred a heavy responsibility, for should anything happen to that officer the people would exact a heavy retribution. A further defence of the Government was made by Lords Derby and Kimberley, the latter indicating the attitude adopted towards General Hicks, who, according to Lord Cranbrook, should have been ordered to retire, without making the attempt to rescue the Egyptian garrisons at Darfur and elsewhere. "In a position of serious difficulty," said Lord Kimberley, "it was considered that Hicks Pasha had been successful, and the steps taken were thought to be wise, although they afterwards proved to be unwise, but it was not a moment when we ought to have interfered peremptorily. If we had not counselled the retirement of the Egyptian troops from the Soudan, we must have been prepared to make ourselves responsible for the administration of it. No consideration should have induced us to impose Egyptian rule on the Soudan—a rule which it would have been disgraceful in this country to fasten on the necks of the Soudanese, and, therefore, if we had interfered at all, our policy could have been only in the direction of retiring entirely from the Soudan. The garrisons in the Soudan were placed there, not by us, but by the Egyptian Government; and the danger to them was caused by the abominable character of the Egyptian Government. It was on that account they were surrounded by an infuriated population. The army of Sir E. Wood was engaged for Egypt proper, and nowhere else. Even if the men had been willing to go to the Soudan, it would have been impolitic to send them. The Egyptians have a horror of the Soudanese service, and it was the knowledge they

would not be called upon to enter it that induced them to serve Sir E. Wood cheerfully. The Sultan declined altogether to allow recruiting in his dominions, and the Government were reduced to adopting the only solution which seemed feasible, or which gave the faintest hope of success." Turning then to the position occupied by General Gordon, and the object of his mission, Lord Kimberley explained that out of regard for his wishes, and in view of his personal safety, they had abstained from sending British troops to Tokar without his knowledge and advice. Lord Kimberley then went on to explain General Gordon's view of his own mission. "He believed that he could conciliate certain tribes and bring about the relief of the garrisons; but if British troops had been known to be operating against the Mahdi, the apparent inconsistency would have been prejudicial to General Gordon's mission. To have sent troops without his concurrence would have been extraordinary and unheard-of conduct. I have long known and admired General Gordon; danger never stopped him, and we should not have been justified in hesitating to accept his services on account of the danger involved. It is not his prestige we trust to so much as his special knowledge of the Soudan, the faith the tribes have in him, and the knowledge we have that he agrees with us as to the policy to be pursued. But, my lords, I heard the noble Viscount say that in announcing to the world that we intended to abandon the Soudan, we had partly destroyed the means of General Gordon's success. But General Gordon desires that it should be as widely known as possible, and he trusts to that as one of the chief instruments of his success. He trusts that the tribes, knowing that they are to be as independent as ever, and that his word is as good as his bond, will, many of them, aid him in restoring order. I do not myself believe that in the Soudan at the present moment the honour and interests of this country have been sacrificed by Her Majesty's Government." The House then divided, and Lord Salisbury's Vote of Censure was carried by 181 to 81; a certain number of the Liberal Peers voting in the majority.

The debate in the House of Commons was somewhat delayed by a further wrangle over Mr. Bradlaugh and his seat. At the beginning of the sitting his colleague, Mr. Labouchere, had moved for a new writ for Northampton in the place of Mr. Bradlaugh, "who had accepted the Stewardship of her Majesty's Manor of the Chiltern Hundreds." Lord R. Churchill led the opposition to the issue of the writ, and was followed by others on the Conservative side, on the ground that the compliance of the Government with the application prejudged the legal question of whether or not Mr. Bradlaugh had taken his seat. The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Childers) and the Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt), however, maintained that the issue of the writ affected not Mr. Bradlaugh and the penalties he might have incurred, but the rights of the constituency only. After a division on the question of adjournment, in which Lord R. Churchill was defeated by

203 to 145, the writ was allowed to issue, and before nightfall Mr. Bradlaugh was again soliciting the votes of the electors of Northampton. The sequel was not difficult to foresee. Mr. Bradlaugh had for his opponent Mr. Richards, a Conservative barrister, who polled only 3,664 votes against 4,032 given to Mr. Bradlaugh, showing a considerable increase in the latter's majority. In 1881 he had been returned by 132 over Mr. Corbett; and in 1882, after his expulsion, by 108. As soon as the state of the poll had been declared, Mr. Bradlaugh wrote to the Speaker (February 21) declaring his intention not to present himself to take the oath until after the Law Courts had decided the question of his liability to the penalty incurred for voting in two divisions last week. Hereupon Sir Stafford Northcote rose and moved his old resolution, directing the Serjeant-at-Arms to exclude Mr. Bradlaugh from the precincts of the House until he gave his engagement not to disturb it with any attempt to take the oath. Mr. Gladstone pointed out in impressive language the great importance of not taking any further step in the matter, after Mr. Bradlaugh had declared his intention to wait for the decision of a Court of Law, till the House had that decision before them, and could reconsider the matter by the light of that decision. But the Conservatives were inexorable; and even though Sir Joseph Pease, who had hitherto steadily voted against Mr. Bradlaugh, now expressed his concurrence with Mr. Gladstone, the division showed a majority of 53 (226 against 173) for Sir Stafford Northcote.

To return, however, to the Vote of Censure. In the House of Commons, after some severe cross-examination to which the Ministerial bench was subjected with regard to the knowledge of the state of affairs in the Soudan in possession of the Government, Sir S. Northcote moved his resolution. A very marked contrast characterised the tone of the debates in the two Houses. Lord Salisbury, confident in the majority at his back, was brilliant, vigorous, and incisive; whilst Lord Granville, in reply, seemed almost apologetic in his tone, and rapidly availed himself of an opportunity to pass aside Lord Salisbury's attack, and to insist upon phases of the question to which no allusion had been made. Sir S. Northcote, on the other hand, aware probably that the result in the Commons was as equally a foregone conclusion in an opposite direction, laboured hard to make his indictment of the Ministerial policy as colourless and unimpassioned as his colleague in the Lords had striven to heighten the tone of the picture he had drawn.

Sir S. Northcote, in the course of his speech, twitted the Government with their frequent disclaimer of all responsibility for what had happened; but it was impossible for them in this fashion to evade a responsibility which the nature of things, as well as their own acts and words, had fastened upon them. He reminded Mr. Gladstone that he had always fixed the responsibility for the Bulgarian outrages on the late Government, because they were the Power which maintained the power of the Porte, and he pointed out

that our armed intervention in Egypt had not only put down Arabi, but had destroyed the Egyptian army and the Egyptian Government. When Lord Dufferin drew up his plan for the new Egyptian army, it was with the full knowledge that the Mahdi was carrying on a not unsuccessful war in the Soudan, and when General Hicks's expedition was organised, Lord Dufferin was cognisant of it, had confidential conversations with the General, and carried on a correspondence with him. The extraordinary treatment which General Hicks had received in the Soudan—the sacrifice which he had been forced to make of his own views—were known to the British Government, which gave him no assistance, neither materially nor by offering appropriate advice to the Egyptian Government, which was in their hands. Tracing the progress of General Hicks's expedition, and his communications with the English officials, Sir S. Northcote maintained that, by wrapping themselves up in a fictitious irresponsibility, the Government had brought themselves into a position where they would be compelled to accept a still more serious responsibility, and from which there was no escape, as it was the consequence of their own acts. Throughout all these transactions the Government had shown themselves more anxious about their irresponsibility than about General Hicks's safety or their own honour. When General Hicks fell, the British Government ought at once to have assumed the control of the policy of Egypt; yet at that very moment they had not only neglected the despairing appeals of General Hicks, but they were actually preparing to withdraw troops from the country. In these and other acts he charged the Government with culpable neglect. Throughout the whole period of their management of Egyptian affairs one vital fault had vitiated their proceedings—that was their innate dawdling in the hope of thereby getting out of difficulties, and that by proclaiming their irresponsibility, somehow or other the crisis would pass away. At the same time, by pursuing the course of breaking up the Ministry of Sherif Pasha, they had struck a fatal blow at their own Egyptian Constitution; they had indefinitely postponed the time when our forces could be withdrawn; if they had not, indeed, brought on themselves the necessity of increasing the army of occupation. Referring to the mission of General Gordon, Sir S. Northcote in conclusion expressed the hope that the Government were not throwing the responsibility upon him, or confusing his position, by making it doubtful whose servant he was. What had happened had, in his opinion, endangered the safety of Lower Egypt, involved considerable risk and responsibility to her Majesty's Government, and weakened the prestige of England throughout the world; it would close the trade route to Equatorial Africa, give a fresh stimulus to the slave trade, and renewed vigour to Mohammedanism.

Mr. Gladstone immediately rose to reply, and at once assumed an attitude and tone very different from that adopted by Lord Granville. Conscious doubtless in the strength of his majority,

despite of the dissentients who pressed for definite action, as well of those consistent Radicals who deprecated all intervention, he defended each step of the Ministerial policy by bold arguments and with passionate eagerness. He commenced by animadverting on the discrepancy between Sir S. Northcote's speech and his motion, inasmuch as he had not advanced a single proof of "inconsistency" or "vacillation," but had simply censured the Government throughout for pursuing a mistaken policy. This discrepancy arose not from inadvertence, nor from want of perception, but because the Opposition did not desire to be bound to any policy whatever. Sir S. Northcote's argument was that Ministers had adopted a wrong policy, and refused to strengthen the Egyptian army in the Soudan, to counsel the Egyptian Government, and to overrule that Government in respect to the Soudan. These were serious charges, but they had nothing to do with vacillation or inconsistency. The situation in Egypt, Mr. Gladstone maintained, was anomalous, inconvenient, and full of political danger, and under the circumstances it was the duty of the House not to confine the debate to the mere party issue, but to search out the root and origin of the evil. The Government, he declared, had not made, but had found the situation, and tracing all the mischief to Lord Salisbury's Dual Control, asserted that they had never had any option as to the policy they might have desired to inaugurate. They had inherited certain engagements from their predecessors, and from those engagements it had never been in their power honourably to extricate themselves. In establishing the Dual Control a great error was committed; but he admitted that the motive and object were to secure a better government for Egypt. He contended that the Government had fulfilled all the obligations imposed upon them. The task they were executing was not for themselves, but for the civilised world. Passing then to the actual dealings of the Government with Egypt since Tel-el-Kebir, Mr. Gladstone related minutely the reforms which had been effected in the judicature, legislature, police, and military organisation; and, defining our position in Egypt, he said the British Government, while it deemed it essential to maintain the Khedive's Government in credit and honour, and not to demand anything from it which necessity did not require, was bound, as the military Power in occupation, to see that what it recommended on vital points was carried out. With regard to the war in the Soudan, if there was anything the Egyptian people abhorred more than another it was the prosecution of that war, and the Government declined to have anything to do with the reconquest of the Soudan. The Government had interfered to require the abandonment of the Soudan as soon as they were justified in carrying to that point what must be considered a high-handed proceeding with regard to the interior administration of Egypt.

With regard to Hicks Pasha's movements, Mr. Gladstone denied that the British Government was in any way bound to support

or assist Hicks Pasha, or to give any advice as to the conduct of the war. To do that would have made us responsible for the war. But we had no commission from Europe to interfere in the Soudan, nor did the Government think that the reconquest of the Soudan was an enterprise for the honour of Egypt or the advantage of the conquered. After the defeat of Hicks Pasha the situation changed, and the Government, coming to the conclusion that the operations in the Soudan would drain the life-blood of Egypt, required the Egyptian Government to abandon it, though they did not take this step a moment before an overpowering necessity arose. They had therefore interposed no obstacle to Baker Pasha's expedition, which, in the opinion of competent judges, had been thought adequate for the immediate purpose of the relief of Sinkat and Tokar. Turning at length to General Gordon, whom he extolled as a hero and a genius, Mr. Gladstone explained that the reason of the delay in his departure was the reluctance of the Egyptian Government to avail themselves of his aid. This having been at last overcome, Gordon was despatched to Khartoum for the purpose of withdrawing, if possible, in safety, the 29,000 soldiers of the Khedive now scattered over the country. After the defeat of Baker it was impossible by anything the Government could have done to relieve Sinkat, while any attempt to do so by force might have imperilled the success of Gordon's plan. The General's mission was not the reconquest of the Soudan, but its peaceful evacuation, and the reconstitution of the country, by giving back to the Sultan the ancestral power which had been suspended during the Egyptian occupation. Therefore, the Government in any steps which they took—and they had taken several preliminary measures which he related—had to consider the danger of thwarting his peaceful mission and endangering his life. Since General Gordon's arrival at Berber he had received telegrams from the Government, and in reply he had stated that he did not think the use of military means for the relief of Tokar would interfere with his mission. The Government at once attempted to effect by diplomatic agency the release of the imprisoned garrisons. It was only on the previous night, at 10 P.M., that they had learnt from Admiral Hewett that his efforts had failed. The Government had thereupon given orders for gathering a British force at Suakim, amounting to somewhere about 4,000 men, for the relief of Tokar, which, however, implied no departure from their opposition to the reconquest of the Soudan. At this point Mr. Gladstone somewhat abruptly closed his speech, adding only, by way of peroration, that if the criticisms of Sir S. Northcote meant anything, they involved a policy that was opposed alike to prudence, to humanity, and to justice. He appealed, therefore, both to the indulgence of the House and to its justice for the acquittal to which he felt the Government were entitled.

Lord R. Churchill followed in support of the resolution, and bitterly reproached the Ministry with attempting to carry out a

policy which was contrary to the sentiments of the country, and of which not a few Liberals were ashamed, though they concealed their feelings. Rapidly passing in review the papers laid before Parliament, Lord R. Churchill showed that they convicted the Government policy of inconsistency even in the employment of General Gordon, that they had vacillated with regard to General Hicks, and had ultimately consented to his starting on a hopeless errand, and then had nursed the belief that Baker Pasha's policemen would restore order in the Soudan. In everything they had attempted, in every step they had taken, their policy was marked by the awful words "too late." In like manner Mr. Edward Stanhope brought a serious indictment against Mr. Gladstone of attempting throughout his speech to evade responsibility and to confuse the real issue by attributing to Sir S. Northcote a wish to reconquer the Soudan. The Khedive's Government had been treated as a cat's-paw, at one time compelled to follow the directions of the British Cabinet, and at others ostensibly left to act upon its own responsibility. Meanwhile the policy of the Home Government had throughout been half-hearted, inconsistent, and unintelligible, and marked by divided councils. When the debate was resumed (February 14) Sir Wilfrid Lawson brought forward his amendment, which proposed to say nothing about the policy of the two previous years, but pledged the Ministry not to interfere further with the Egyptian people in the selection of their own Government. He attributed all the present troubles in Egypt to our unjust and high-handed proceedings in that country. Sympathising with the motion, he said it came too late. In fact, just as the Government were beginning to do what was right and get out of the Soudan, the Opposition came forward to condemn them. The policy of the Government, as he understood it, was to render a fresh service to humanity by attempting to rescue the beleaguered garrisons. Having done that, they should retire as speedily as possible from the country. This amendment Mr. Gladstone briefly and decidedly rejected, acknowledging at the same time that the policy of the Government could not be more happily described than by the words "Rescue and retire." The Government, moreover, would be avoiding their plain duty if they shrank from a vote being taken on their actions, or if they allowed the House to assume the responsibility of laying down a policy.

The principal speech of the evening, however, was one by Mr. W. E. Forster, who, whilst announcing his intention of voting with the Government, exhibited their shortcomings and waverings more trenchantly than any of the Conservative speakers had done. Referring to the very large majority with which the Vote of Censure had been carried in the House of Lords, he said he was not one of those who treated it with contempt. The House of Lords was one of the powers of the country, and it was all the more important that the House of Commons, if it did not agree with the House of Lords, should very clearly show the reason why.

Although he did not agree with the action of the Government until quite recently, the action of the Opposition would not have been likely to receive his approval. Turning to the charge of inconsistency brought against the Government, Mr. Forster said: "I do not in the slightest degree coincide with that charge, but I must confess that I think there was some reason for the charge that the Government did not quickly enough realise the true policy. I think that they did not quickly enough realise the meaning of what happened more than a year ago—that they did not realise what that battle of Tel-el-Kebir meant. Now I think that that battle of Tel-el-Kebir ought not to have been fought. That battle put us in the position that after it there was no power in Egypt except that of the English Government. The Prime Minister said, 'We have taken the responsibility of military operations which reduced the country, and the army was entirely broken up, and the institutions of the country were gone. We have before us the work of reconstitution.' Well, how are we to deal with that work? By giving excellent advice? Advice is a good thing, but I cannot conceive anything less likely to succeed than the attempt of a Western nation to govern an Oriental country by advice to Oriental administrators." That the Soudan was not to be reconquered gave him pleasure, but why, when they had power in Egypt, did the Government not protest against the attempt at its reconquest? It was the presence of the English army alone made the effort to conquer the Soudan possible, and the Government should have seen that, and forbidden the attempt from the first. When, however, we at last forced the Egyptians into the policy of abandoning the Soudan, the responsibility became visible, and the Government should have aided in the relief of Sinkat, as it was about to aid in the relief of Tokar, which he did not believe would be too late. He thought, in fact, that the Ministry should have seen their responsibilities earlier; but now that they did see them, he believed they would perform them, and they should have his hearty support. Mr. Forster did not openly advocate a temporary Protectorate, but the entire drift of his remarks upon the uselessness of mere advice was in that direction.

The matter not less than the tone of Mr. Forster's speech touched the "official" Liberals to the quick, and their organs in the press were not slow in taking up the case which Sir Charles Dilke gave them; and it was indicative of the anxiety which the Government felt as to the effect of Mr. Forster's criticisms, that they put forward as their representative the Minister whose name had been most closely connected with the early history of the Egyptian imbroglio, and to whose persistent refusal to accept Arabi as even a possible ally much of our subsequent trouble was ascribed. In replying to Mr. Forster as the "candid friend" who had put the case against the Government more clearly than it had been yet stated, Sir Charles Dilke maintained that but for Sherif Pasha's mistaken policy in the Soudan we should have already obtained "a satisfactory guarantee for

the maintenance of peace, order, and prosperity." As to stopping General Hicks's expedition, he added :—"Let the House remember that at the time that officer was at the head of a conquering force, which in a recent engagement had inflicted a loss of 500 men upon the enemy with a loss of only two men to himself. What would have been said if at that time we had pushed back the Egyptian frontier by 500 miles and withdrawn that army against the opinion of every man of any authority in Egypt? To have done so would have increased the hatred of all the governing people of that country against us." The policy of repudiation might have been wise or unwise, but it was before Parliament at the time, and not one syllable was uttered in condemnation of it. When it was argued that the Government was responsible in another way for Hicks's defeat, because they ought to have sent General Wood's Egyptian army to his succour, it should be remembered that that army was enlisted on the faith of a personal promise to each man that he should not be sent to the Soudan. "Our policy is to withdraw Egyptian rule where it has been a curse, and to maintain, strengthen, and improve it where it is a national Government and where it has life, and where, on the coast of the Red Sea, it may be used by ourselves and other nations for the purpose of preventing the slave trade. At the three main points where the decision of these questions rest we are served by three of the ablest men who ever served this country—by Sir E. Baring at Cairo, by Admiral Sir W. Hewett at Suakim, and by General Gordon at Khartoum. I think there are few countries which can boast of having such men, not only who are characterised by great courage and ability, but also by an extraordinary devotion to duty. We ask and we follow the advice which these men give us."

This policy was totally opposed to that of the Conservatives. Sir R. Cross explained in a short but emphatic speech that, if circumstances had made us the masters of Egypt, and there was no Government left in Egypt but our own, we should recognise the full measure of our responsibility. To this Mr. John Morley, from the Radical ranks, replied that such a speech committed the Conservative party to annexation. He was in favour of the evacuation of the Soudan, though he confessed it would aggravate the difficulty of leaving Egypt; and, in answer to the plea that it would lead to an increase in the slave trade, he asserted that the efforts to put down that traffic had been an absolute failure. Though there might not have been inconsistency in the conduct of the Government, there had been miscalculation; and, in regard to the time of our future departure, he urged that we should be content with establishing some less elaborate institutions than those laid down in Lord Dufferin's despatch. After arguing in favour of a modification of the Law of Liquidation, he repeated his objections to an annexation, pointing out, among other things, that it would precipitate the revival of the Eastern Question, while depriving us of any effective share in the solution of it. Instead

of being a triumph over France, it would be giving hostages to her, and would indefinitely increase our responsibilities without adequate benefit to Egypt.

It would have seemed that by this time nearly all possible views on the Government must have found expression, but nevertheless the debate was kept up with flagging interest for two more nights; in spite, moreover, of Mr. Gladstone's appeal for an economy of the public time. The real sting of the Vote of Censure had been taken out when, on the very day on which it was to be brought forward, orders were given for the relief of Tokar, and a force moved towards Suakim. Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice apologetically urged that the overwhelming defeat of General Hicks had not only taken the Government by surprise, but had found them unprepared for immediate action, for Lord Dufferin had spoken of the Egyptian troops in hopeful terms. But, as Sir M. Hicks-Beach pointed out in one of the most effective speeches from the Conservative side, the experience gained from General Hicks's defeat was speedily lost, since Baker Pasha was allowed to start on a similar errand with troops drawn from similar sources. He considered, therefore, that the Government should have known, if it did not really know, that Baker Pasha had not an adequate force at his command, and that he was not loyally supported at Cairo. He canvassed at some length the circumstances of General Gordon's mission, characterising the attempt to throw on him the decision whether Tokar should be relieved as an insult, and asking for some further information as to the reason why he had not been employed sooner. As to the abandonment of the Soudan, he maintained that the Government had no right to withdraw civilising influences from Khartoum. He rejoiced, however, that the Government had been led by these events to throw off the miserable pretence of irresponsibility, and if they would acknowledge openly that circumstances had placed them in possession of supreme power in Egypt, foreign Powers would welcome their decision. If an English policy were to be enforced in Egypt, it should be by the hands of English officers, and the bondholders might be asked to give some assistance in placing the Egyptian finances on a better footing.

Very few of these questions obtained specific answers beyond the admission that the defeat of Baker Pasha was wholly unforeseen, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the fourth night of the debate, confined himself almost exclusively to the future policy of the Government:—"We have sent an expedition to relieve Tokar, and when that expedition has done its work, our policy will be to effect the evacuation of the Soudan by peaceable means. In the second place, our policy is firmly and unhesitatingly to continue the occupation of Egypt until the objects for which we first went there are accomplished. Our third intention is to keep in view our prospective retirement from Egypt at a time when the Khedive's Government shall be in a fit state to administer the affairs of the

country without our assistance. And our fourth object is in the meantime to restore as far as we can the finances of Egypt, which have been burdened with the expenses resulting from the disturbances at Alexandria and the operations in the Soudan. To that policy the only alternative was that of annexation. But if 10,000 English troops are permanently stationed in Egypt, that means an addition of 20,000 men to our army at home. I assume for a moment that the 10,000 men in Egypt are to be paid for out of the finances of Egypt; but I do not know whether it is possible for us to charge the consequential increase of our home army upon the same finances. This establishment of 10,000 men means a charge on our finances of a million a year, and if the number were 15,000 men it would mean a charge of a million and a half, and if 20,000 two millions a year. That charge would be incurred for our army alone, quite irrespective of the charge which must also fall upon us in connection with our fleet. Is the House prepared to burden this country with something like two millions a year? Sir, I repeat there is no middle course to be pursued, and for my own part I only hope that the House of Commons will not be led away by the charm of a scheme of this kind from the reasonable, sensible, practical course which her Majesty's Government have recommended, and which they intend to carry out."

Earlier in the evening Mr. Marriott, one of the members for Brighton, made a speech in which he definitely severed his allegiance to the party by which he had been elected. His divergence from their policy had been yearly becoming greater since the day when, on the subject of the Clôture, he expressed his views as to Mr. Chamberlain, the Caucus, and the new rules of debate in terms of bitter hostility, and placed Mr. Gladstone's most important "new rule" in jeopardy. On the present occasion he declared that Mr. Gladstone having broken away from the traditions of true Liberalism handed down by Lords Russell and Palmerston, he should resign his seat, and, by applying to his electors, ascertain whether they approved of the Government policy.

On the last night of the debate (February 19) the Conservatives found another ally in Mr. J. Cowen, who, in a vigorous speech, denounced the Government as responsible for the disasters which, as they possessed absolute power in Egypt, they could have prevented. They had thus compromised the honour of the nation and the interests of humanity, and no sophistry could reconcile their acts with their professions when in Opposition. Where, he asked, was the frothy sympathy with the Bulgarian horrors and the empty rhetoric of the Midlothian campaign? As to the defence of the Government, it was childish and pusillanimous to throw the blame on their predecessors, and, not having arrived at the same pitch of political ethics as Mr. Forster and others, who thought one thing and acted another, he meant to support the Resolution by his vote.

In a very different strain, but scarcely less damaging to the

Government, was the speech of Mr. Goschen, another "candid friend," who, whilst adopting the same line as Mr. Forster, had come to a like conclusion by a very different train of reasoning. Mr. Goschen urged that the question which the House had to ask itself was this—supposing it approved of the present policy of the Government and trusted in their pledges to carry it out, What effect would be produced by a change of Government? He admitted that the policy which the Government would have to pursue must be different from the past, and it was evident that the Government must learn the lesson which had been forced on them by unforeseen events. Sufficient allowance, he thought, had not been made for the stupendous difficulties with which the Government had to deal, and among these he enumerated the growing but novel practice of cross-examining Ministers on matters of foreign policy, and the problem of governing a subject race like the Egyptians in partnership with another Power like the Porte. Another difficulty was the *locus standi* possessed in Egypt by fourteen foreign Powers; and, addressing Sir W. Lawson, he assured him that our withdrawal would not leave the Egyptians "to stew in their own juice," but to be cooked and eaten by some other Power. After some personal references to the Egyptian Loans and his own share in the New Loan, Mr. Goschen described the Law of Liquidation, which he showed was not drawn up in the interest of the bondholders, but provided that the claims of the country should precede theirs. With regard to the future, he urged that the Government should consider not merely the reforms they desired to be carried out, but the instruments to which the working of them was to be entrusted, and the present cumbrous system of advising and controlling the Egyptian officials must be changed. Commenting on the events comprehended in the motion, he said he was unable to accept the argument of the Government that General Hicks was a victorious general when disaster overtook him, and he thought they might have repeated Lord Dufferin's advice to the Egyptian Government to confine itself to a certain portion of the Soudan. He differed also from the view they took of General Baker's position. But on the whole, having faith in the Government, and seeing that Europe also believed its pledges and was ready to trust it, he preferred to go with the Government rather than give a blank cheque to Lord Salisbury.

The summing-up of the case on behalf of the Government was left to Lord Hartington, who brought back the question to the simple issue whether or not they had not availed themselves of the best lights available to them, and had not done all in their power to conciliate the conflicting views of all the sections of the Liberal party. In that party were those who were as eager for a British Protectorate as any of the Conservatives; whilst others, regardless or ignorant of diplomatic difficulties and international intrigue, were for immediate withdrawal. It was therefore not altogether without reason that Lord Hartington complained that in the debate

of the evening little reference had been made to the defence of the Government, as set forth in the speeches of the Prime Minister, and that no answer had been given to the Prime Minister's charge against the Opposition that they had no policy. The policy of non-intervention in the Soudan, as laid down in the despatch of Lord Dufferin, was thoroughly well known to the House and acquiesced in throughout last Session by all, including the Opposition, and no exception had been taken to it. It was a right and wise policy, he contended, inasmuch as our intervention in Egypt for clear and defined purposes in no way committed us to interference in the internal affairs of the Soudan, where our intervention would have committed us to indefinite responsibilities. The Ministerial policy was to maintain our garrisons until our reforms in Egypt had been accomplished and sufficient stability had been given to the Government to allow our military support to be withdrawn. But the reformed Government which they wished to set up was a native Government, though assisted for a long time, perhaps permanently, by English officials both military and civil. This, he contended, was a safer and more acceptable policy than that which he understood to be recommended by the Opposition of substituting a single control for the Dual, supported by a military occupation and administered by Englishmen, not as a temporary expedient, but as a permanent arrangement. After defending the abandonment of the Soudan as wise and inevitable, he dealt with the charge of not relieving the garrisons, contending that we were under no obligation to attempt their relief, and that the Government had every reason to believe that Baker Pasha's expedition would be successful. To have sent an expedition of British troops earlier would have been impossible, and would have gravely compromised the success of General Gordon's mission. Although he admitted that the Opposition was not bound to formulate a policy, the House would be more ready to adopt this resolution if they had a more distinct understanding what that policy was. Up to the present moment the only policy the Opposition had propounded amounted to annexation, but their divided councils showed that they had no decided views, but were as ready as ever to commit the country to undefined engagements.

Sir S. Northcote at once rose to close a debate which had by this time worn itself threadbare, and rallied the Government on the change which their policy had undergone between the speech of the Prime Minister on the first night and that of his colleague who had just sat down. As for the complaint that the Opposition had no policy, he said that it was the same now as when they were in office, and he had expounded it a dozen times. It was not to extend our territory, but to give such an efficient administration to Egypt as would enable her to maintain herself with credit, and to protect our road to India. The present Government had spoiled this policy, and the Opposition disclaimed all responsibility for the bombardments, battles, and destruction which had signal-

ised the dealings of the present Government with Egypt. No answer had been given to the charge made in his resolution, and, whatever might be the result of the division, the debate showed that the confidence of a large number of gentlemen in the House and a still larger number outside had been shaken, and that the future conduct of the Government in Egypt would be closely watched.

Sir Wilfrid Lawson having withdrawn his amendment, the House divided on Sir S. Northcote's resolution, which was rejected by 311 to 292 votes; thirty Home Rulers and four Liberals—Mr. Cowen, Mr. Marriott, Mr. C. Fitzwilliam, and Mr. M. Guest—voting against the Government. And about the same number (34), of whom the majority were Liberals of various shades, absented themselves from the division, which had the rare good fortune of being equally satisfactory to both sides.

The situation, after the division, was thus summarised by the *Times*:—"Two points have been made clear during the debate, and especially in the closing speeches. The first is that the Opposition have fatally exhibited their weakness, and have missed an opportunity which may not present itself again by failing to declare boldly for a British Protectorate over Egypt. The second is that by voting with the Government Liberal members do not oppose themselves to the policy of remaining in Egypt 'until all the duties we have undertaken shall be discharged.' The declaration of the Ministerial majority was received, as a matter of course, with cheers, but Ministers themselves are too conversant with practical affairs not to feel that they have had a narrow escape and a sharp warning. Their victory was for some time dubious." The *Standard*, although feeling that the result was a shock to common sense, declared that it was inevitable, according to the rules of party warfare; but had the question been submitted to any ordinary assembly of Englishmen, Sir S. Northcote's resolution would have been carried with hardly a dissentient voice. "Party votes, not honest convictions, had saved the Government. Ministers must make the most of a success which leaves them their places, but does not clear their reputation." Even the *Daily News* admitted that the debate had not been useless, since it had warned the Government that the country is not ready to abandon responsibilities which it had solemnly undertaken; whilst the *Daily Telegraph*, in a similar spirit, allowed that the Ministers at the eleventh hour, having found their way back to the true path of policy, had earned their right to another chance.

The resumption of the adjourned debate on Mr. Parnell's amendment gave the Irish members in general an opportunity of giving their views on the condition of affairs in their own country. It furnished, moreover, to Mr. O'Connor Power the means of stating his objections to the Parnellite policy, which had, in his opinion, not only lost to Ireland a measure of local government, and other substantial benefits, but had entailed upon the country the most

stringent and hateful Coercion Code ever imposed upon any people. Amidst very general cheering and assent, Mr. O'Connor Power expressed his belief that the great mass of the people of England (distinguished from the ruling classes) were willing to give Ireland as much self-government as was compatible with the supreme authority of the Imperial Parliament and the integrity of the Empire, and he insisted that when they had, as at present, a Government which was disposed to give them more than half of what they desired, it was not only a mistaken, but an unpatriotic, policy on the part of Irishmen to pursue them as if they were enemies of the human race, and enemies of Ireland in particular. He moreover exposed the anomaly of the Land Leaguers denouncing the intimidation practised by Orangemen, and ignoring altogether the much worse intimidation practised by themselves. After some lengthy speeches, which added but little to the general knowledge of Irish affairs, Mr. Parnell's amendment was rejected by 81 to 30 (February 22), and on the fourteenth night of the Session, five of which had been given to the Vote of Censure, the Address was agreed to. On the Report, Mr. Stanhope pressed for an assurance that, in spite of the annexation of Merv by the Russians, British influence should continue to preponderate in Afghanistan. To this appeal, Sir C. Dilke replied that the Government held to their idea of making Afghanistan a friendly and an independent power, and that there was nothing to lead them to suppose that the good-will of this country was not highly prized by the Ameer.

There had been little opportunity for other Parliamentary business in either House. The Lord Chancellor had introduced three law bills, chiefly intended to amend existing laws (February 8). Lord Carlingford, having declared that the Government could not accept the Duke of Richmond's Bill, forcing the Privy Council to exclude foreign cattle on unsatisfactory evidence of disease, presented the Government Bill on the same subject. Its principal object was to submit cattle suffering from "foot and mouth disease" to the restrictions imposed by the Act of 1878 in cases of "cattle plague" and "pleuro-pneumonia"; and further, to enable the Privy Council to exclude the cattle of any country when there was reasonable ground for suspecting that the cattle imported would not be free from infectious disease. The Government Bill was a distinct concession to the agricultural interest; and whilst not going to the length demanded by Mr. Chaplin in the resolution he had carried against the Government, it offered a fair basis for the settlement of a thorny question, needing especially delicate handling at a time when the enfranchisement of rural tenants was approaching, and with or without it the possibility of a general election.

After a debate on the second reading of both Bills (February 19), the last stage was rapidly reached (February 21). The Duke of Richmond's Bill, which had precedence, was formally passed

through Committee with the intimation from Lord Carlingford that the Government could not accept the measure. The House then at once took up the discussion of the clause of Lord Carlingford's own Bill, to which the Duke of Richmond, by 75 to 45, carried an amendment, which imposed upon the Privy Council the prohibitory powers against which they in vain protested. The amendment was nevertheless accepted, and engrafted in the Bill, and in this form reported to the House.

Lord Dunraven, on another evening (February 18), brought under the notice of the House of Lords the removal of Lord Rossmore from the Commission of the Peace in Ireland, on the ground of having endangered the public peace, by leading a procession into close proximity with a Nationalist meeting at Rosslea. Lord Dunraven maintained that the utmost which could be alleged against Lord Rossmore was that he had taken a particular road contrary to the advice of the proper authorities; although not an Orangeman himself, nor a sympathiser with them, he (Lord Dunraven) held that the Orangemen had undergone great provocation, and had, on the whole, conducted themselves with creditable self-restraint. Lord Carlingford, in reply, having said that Government would regard the resolution as a censure upon the Lord-Lieutenant and Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and that as such it should have been moved from the front Opposition Bench, and not from the Cross Benches, after some discussion, the motion was withdrawn.

The condition of the poor in London and elsewhere, which had occupied the attention of statesmen as well as of philanthropists during the recess, was brought before Parliament at an early date (February 22) by the Marquess of Salisbury, who, in moving for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the housing of the working classes in populous places, expressed his opinion that, though this question of the dwellings of the poor was not a political one, no political question exceeded it in importance. It was not, as some persons thought, a purely sanitary question, and that if the sanitary measures now in the Statute Book were duly carried out, they would be sufficient to meet the evil. It was certain that, whether owing to some insuperable obstacle to the working of the Sanitary Acts, or to negligence of the authorities, those beneficent measures had not effected what had been expected from them. Connected with sewage was water supply and the water companies, which had baffled more than one Administration. The remedy for all that could not be ascertained by discussion in Parliament or in the newspapers. Accurate investigation was required as to the evil and as to the appliances in which a remedy would be found. Sir R. Cross's Act had done much good in respect of the structures occupied by the working classes, but it had not done all that was required. The compensation for ground in the metropolis was very high. Some persons would meet this by putting a part of the cost on the ground landlord

or the leaseholder, as the case might be. To such persons he would say that if they had resort to confiscation at all, they ought to get all they could by it, and not confine themselves to confiscating the shilling or sixpence a foot to which the owner was entitled. Lord Salisbury then turned to overcrowding, which he regarded as the dominant difficulty of the question. The knocking down of unhealthy houses was not a remedy, because its immediate effect was to increase the overcrowding of all the remaining houses in which the working people could be accommodated. Unless Parliament could cope with overcrowding, it would defeat all their efforts in this matter. A fitting subject of inquiry by the Commission would be as to the numbers who required house accommodation, and the radius within which a certain amount of accommodation was required. He did not seek to throw on any class blame for the existing state of things; but as to the charge that much of it was caused by the clearance of estates, he pointed to the circumstance that the census returns showed a considerable increase in the number of houses in the counties contiguous to London in 1881, as compared with 1871. He thought that agricultural distress had much to do with overcrowding in the poorer districts of the metropolis. While not favouring any great scheme of State interference, he was in favour of Parliament avoiding cowardice in this matter, because there were no absolute rules or principles in politics, and because material and moral laws ought to prevent the State from being indifferent to the social condition of the people.

The Government having announced the Queen's intention to issue a Commission in the terms of Lord Salisbury's motion, omitting the words "in populous places," the Prince of Wales at once rose to make his first speech in the House of Peers, expressing his great pleasure that this momentous question had been brought forward. He was flattered by the intimation that he was to be appointed a member of the Commission, because he took the liveliest interest in the question of improving the dwellings of the working classes, and ameliorating the condition of the working people themselves. A few days previously he had visited dwellings in St. Pancras and Holborn, the state of which was disgraceful, and he hoped that the result of the investigation by the Royal Commission would be measures of a thorough and drastic kind.

On the following day a Royal Commission was gazetted, of which Sir Charles Dilke, as President of the Local Government Board, was the chairman; and amongst the members were the Prince of Wales, Cardinal Manning, the Marquess of Salisbury, the Earl of Shaftesbury, the Bishop of Bedford, Mr. Broadhurst, M.P., &c. There was some wish expressed that Miss Octavia Hill should be added to the Commissioners, but it was decided that her exceptional knowledge of the poor and their ways of living could be best utilised when given as evidence on which the Commissioners could frame their report.

The only other business of importance taken in the House of Commons had been the attempt (February 13) on the part of the Government to revive the Standing Order on "Grand Committees" agreed to among Mr. Gladstone's new rules of December, 1882. The wish of the Government was to refer to the Committee on Trade Mr. Chamberlain's promised measure for the protection of life and property at sea; a proposal to make the Railway Commission permanent with extended powers; whilst to the Grand Committee on Law would be referred four measures, one dealing with corrupt proceedings at municipal elections, another relating to the law of evidence, a third to the registration of deeds, and the fourth to stolen goods. Mr. Raikes opposed the appointment of these Committees on constitutional principles, as well as on the ground that the work done by them could be better done in a Committee of the whole House, and after a long discussion the matter was talked out. A few days later (February 25) the question was revived, and after Mr. Parnell had been defeated on a motion to create a Standing Committee of Irish members for the consideration of Irish Bills, the resolution as proposed by the Government was agreed to.

Meanwhile outside Parliament one or two events were taking place which for the time attracted more public attention than the debate at Westminster. From various parts of the country complaints were heard as to the slackness of Sir S. Northcote's leadership of the Opposition. "The great Lancashire crowd," wrote a leading member of the Manchester Conservatives, "was impatient of continually halting policies and continually mistaken parties," and was eager for more vigorous measures. The metropolitan Conservatives, through one who claimed the right to speak on their behalf, declared that the dual control of the party, in the hands of Lord Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote, had been a disastrous failure. These and similar utterances seemed to point to a desire on the part of a large section of Conservatives to break altogether with the "Squires" and to recognise a Tory democracy as the future basis of the party. By public consent Lord Randolph Churchill was hailed as the leader of this movement, and the course of events, both in Parliament and outside, showed that he was rapidly acquiring an influence with his colleagues far out of proportion with the numerical following which was assigned to the Fourth party. In Parliament, however, no symptom of the titular leader's influence was discoverable, and at a meeting of the Conservative members held at the Carlton Club (February 24) Sir S. Northcote's reception was hearty enough to dissipate all rumours as to his waning popularity.

Nor was there much appearance of any hesitation on the part of the electorate. In West Somersetshire Mr. C. Elton, the Conservative candidate, a local squire as well as a distinguished lawyer, easily defeated Lord Kilcoursie, the Liberal, by 3,757 votes against 2,995—a majority nearly four times as great as that by which Mr. Acland had been defeated at the General Election. In Brighton the contest, from the amount of personal irritation on both sides, was

more exciting, but none the less decisive in favour of the Conservatives. Mr. Marriott, in pursuance of his promise, applied for the Chiltern Hundreds as soon as the vote had been taken on the Vote of Censure. The new writ, in accordance with custom, was moved (February 21) by Lord R. Grosvenor, the Government whip, although it had been anticipated that Mr. Winn, his Conservative colleague, would have acted on this occasion. Mr. Marriott's opponent was Mr. Romer, Q.C., who was cordially supported by the strength of the Liberal party. Personal motives were freely attributed to Mr. Marriott to account for his sudden change of opinions; but the evidence brought in support of such charges was at best shadowy, and apparently had no better foundation than Mr. Marriott's own firm conviction that he was especially marked down for exemplary punishment by the Birmingham Caucus, because in 1882 he had denounced its operations and taunted Mr. Chamberlain in a bitter speech which that gentleman had had the good taste to leave unanswered. The charges against the President of the Board of Trade Mr. Marriott had revived in a pamphlet which appeared shortly before his fresh appeal to his constituents. It was obvious from its tone and tenour that it was impossible for him longer to support the policy of a Cabinet of which Mr. Chamberlain was recognised as one of the leading influences, and Mr. Marriott's appeal to his constituents to decide whether he still retained their confidence was therefore imperative. The result of the poll was very remarkable, even in a constituency like that of Brighton, which has constantly swayed from one side to the other. At the general election of 1880 the sitting members were both Conservatives, and both lost their seats, the two Liberals, Mr. Hollond and Mr. Marriott, heading the poll by 4,913 and 4,906 votes respectively, whilst Mr. Ashbury, the defeated Conservative, received 4,739. On the present occasion, however, Mr. Marriott polled 5,478, whilst Mr. Romer, in every respect an eligible candidate and a powerful speaker, could only obtain from the party which had previously returned Mr. Marriott 4,021 votes. Mr. Marriott's changed views therefore found a very considerable justification in the verdict of his constituents, for the Liberal candidate polled 711 less votes than did Mr. Marriott in 1880, whilst he received 559 votes more as a Conservative than he had done when standing as a Liberal.

As soon as the report on the Address had been agreed to (February 22), Sir Henry Brand rose and announced his immediate intention of retiring from the Speakership. When the House next met (February 25) Mr. Gladstone moved the customary vote of thanks. The Premier dwelt first on the great increase in the duties and difficulties of the chair, and was warmly cheered from both sides in declaring that but for the tact, firmness, and courage displayed by Sir Henry Brand those difficulties would have been gravely increased. A deep sense of gratitude, therefore, he went on to say, burned in every breast, and the House earnestly desired

that many years of public service and private usefulness might be spared to the Speaker. Sir Stafford Northcote, in seconding the motion, gave expression to the deep feeling of regret on the Opposition benches at the Speaker's retirement, and the high appreciation of the value of his services, and added a few words expressing his own individual gratitude for the wise counsel and generous assistance he had often received from the Speaker. Mr. Parnell, speaking on behalf of the Irish members, said that, while they were desirous of acknowledging the personal courtesy and consideration always extended to them by the Speaker, the conviction that his action had produced injustice and wrong and hardship to their country would compel them to say "No" to the motion. Mr. O'Donnell also referred to certain acts of the Speaker which had been detrimental to the interests of the Irish party. Lord Henry Lennox, Mr. Newdegate, and Mr. Gregory supported the motion, which was carried unanimously, with the exception of a few "Noes" from the Irish benches.

The Speaker, in acknowledging the vote, gave credit to Mr. Parnell and Mr. O'Donnell for being actuated by a sense of public duty. At the same time, he begged them to believe that his action on the occasions referred to was also dictated by a sense of duty. He was very sensible of his shortcomings; but if during his tenure of the chair he had been of any service in helping to maintain the high character of the House he should not have lived in vain.

Sir Henry Brand remained in the chair throughout the remainder of the sitting; and when the House broke up he was warmly cheered on leaving the chair.

The Speaker's retirement had naturally been anticipated and discussed for some months, and the selection of his successor had been keenly canvassed. It was felt by not a few Liberals of various shades that the Government would be displaying not only good taste but sound judgment in proposing, as the first Speaker to be elected after the passing of the new rules, a member of the minority. In this way they could dissipate the idea which was widely spread, that the new rules in the hands of a partisan Speaker might be the effectual means of stifling opposition. On the other hand, it was maintained that there was no reason to fear that rules which had so far been either inoperative or allowed to remain in abeyance could be suddenly enforced except with the general consent of the House, and that therefore there was no object in departing from the ordinary custom of selecting the Speaker from the majority. In any case it was on this latter course that the Government decided, and at first Mr. Goschen was strongly urged to allow himself to be put forward as the Government nominee. After much hesitation he was obliged for physical reasons—which his doctors pronounced insuperable—to decline an office for which a quick eye, as well as a sharp ear and a ready tongue, is indispensable. The names of Mr. Courtney

and Mr. Whitbread when put forward in the press were favourably received by the public; but in the one case the temptations of a political career, and in the other claims of private life, were understood to stand in the way of the selection of either. Whilst Sir M. W. Ridley was unanimously and Mr. C. Raikes partially supported by their own party (and the former by many outside it), it was officially intimated that the choice of the Government had fallen upon Mr. Arthur Wellesley Peel, one of the Liberal members for Warwick, and the youngest son of the statesman, Sir Robert Peel. Mr. Peel had sat continuously in Parliament since 1865, and had filled numerous subordinate posts in successive Liberal Ministries, including that of Patronage Secretary to the Treasury, which had also been held by his predecessor, Sir H. Brand. He was proposed as Speaker by Mr. Whitbread, who in his speech showed that connection with Government had never been a barrier to election, and described the new difficulties which beset the chair arising from new duties and untried points of order. After being formally seconded by Mr. Rathbone, Mr. Peel was unanimously chosen by the House. In acknowledging the honour conferred upon him, the Speaker elect, in a speech which greatly impressed the House, said that he was well aware that he owed his elevation mainly to his father's connection with that House. "He would make no professions when professions might so soon be tested by experience, but he would lay aside all that savoured of political predilection, and subordinate everything to the great interests of the House at large." He trusted that he might be permitted "not only to maintain the formal rules of the House, and to hand on its traditions, but above all its inestimable tradition of that personal courtesy, that interchange of chivalry between member and member, which he believed compatible with the most effective party debating." The choice of the Commons was of course at once ratified by the Crown. Sir Henry Brand was raised to the peerage as Viscount Hampden, and the customary pension to the Speaker on retirement was voted without opposition from any quarter.

CHAPTER III.

General Gordon's Mission—The Expedition to Suakim—The Supplementary Estimate for Expenditure in Egypt—Mr. Labouchere's Amendment—Debate on General Gordon's Position—Proposed Conference—The Second Vote of Censure—Attitude of Messrs. Goschen and Forster—Negotiations with France—The Multiple Control—Earl Grey on the Situation—The Anglo-French Agreement—Meeting of the Conference—The Third Vote of Censure—The Conference and its Outcome.

THE result of the division on the Vote of Censure in both Houses was sufficient evidence to the Conservative leaders that in attacking the Egyptian policy of the Government they had found a subject on which there were many shades of opinion in the Liberal ranks. They saw, with some reason, that on this point the allegiance of the rank and file of the party to Mr. Gladstone was not so hearty as on other points, and they therefore naturally hoped by constantly renewed assaults to obtain some definite advantage over their opponents in Parliament, or to force upon public notice the policy of the Cabinet. To ensure this, questions were put and motions proposed at every shifting phase of the question. What the Ministry declared to be the natural development of events, or of their own policy, the Opposition branded as the spasmodic and unregulated movements of a wavering policy, of divided counsels, or of half-recognised responsibility. In order, therefore, to understand the views of the rival parties, it is necessary to disconnect the history of the Egyptian imbroglio (as well as of the Franchise Bill) from the other topics of the Session, and to follow, as far as possible, the aim and bearing of their respective tactics. On the very night (February 29) on which Mr. Gladstone explained the principles upon which the Franchise Bill was based, a desultory discussion of nearly two hours had delayed the Premier's anxiously awaited speech; and again on the resumption of the debate (March 3) Sir Wilfrid Lawson intervened with a motion of adjournment in order to discuss the state of affairs in the Soudan. His intervention at this moment arose out of Mr. Gladstone's refusal to give a pledge that General Gordon should not be permitted to wage war against the Soudanese; but the general support his motion obtained from the Conservatives arose more probably from the dissatisfaction provoked in their ranks by Mr. Gladstone's and Lord Hartington's vague replies with regard to General Gordon's powers and his exact position. The latter read the instructions under which General Graham was to act for the relief of Tokar and the protection of Suakim. He added that General Stephenson had received orders to send a British force up the Nile to support the Egyptian troops, if Sir E. Baring concurred in the policy of such a course. In all these menaces of armed intervention Sir W. Lawson found ground for condemning the Government policy, which had

directly led to the massacre of the Arabs between Suakim and Tokar, and was a violation of the assurance by which the Government had obtained support on the Vote of Confidence. Mr. Gladstone replied with warmth that operations had not been undertaken in a vindictive spirit, but that Tokar could not be relieved without an action which brought home forcibly to the minds of the Arabs the object of our expedition and the power at our command, and he deprecated strongly these repeated attempts to force the Government to break silence as to its intentions. On this Sir S. Northcote remarked that the Government must be prepared for continual pressure so long as they declined to give a clear and definite explanation of their policy. From the beginning their course had been full of inconsistency and indecision, and the recent operations had been forced on the Government by their former persistent disclaimer of all responsibility.

Two days later (March 5) the attack on the Ministry was again renewed in both Houses. Lord Granville repeated that, though the Government neither meant to annex nor to permanently occupy Egypt, it would be an act of treachery to Europe, as well as to Egypt, to withdraw the British troops before there was a reasonable prospect of a stable and useful government in that country. And Mr. Gladstone hinted, for the first time, that Ministers might yet find it necessary to make some modification in their policy in Egypt proper. At least he claimed exemption from the obligation "to form any new conclusion, or to modify any old conclusion" until the military operations in the Soudan were ended. Till then "it would be idle for us to attempt to say, or even to consider, what our position in Egypt may be." "However, we will not," Mr. Gladstone hastened to add, "assume the government of Egypt." To do so would be "a gross breach of the public law of Europe," and it would commit us to "the government of a Mahommedan people by Christian rulers." Lord Hartington's demand for 370,000*l.* as a supplementary Army Vote, including 100,000*l.* for the expenses of General Graham's expedition, gave rise to a protracted debate and the most contradictory assertions. Colonel Stanley declared that the Government had entirely failed to carry out the programme with which they had gone to Egypt, and that up to the present time the sole result of their intervention had been the shaking of the Egyptian army and administration. Mr. Gladstone retorted that the whole root of the Egyptian difficulty lay in the guarantee given to the Khedive by Lord Beaconsfield's Government. Egypt was tranquil and rapidly becoming prosperous. As to General Gordon's mission, the Government recognised their full responsibility for his acts as long as he remained there with their assent, but they did not think it desirable to discuss his future plans. Mr. Labouchere, from the Radical benches, opposed the Ministerial policy, maintaining that the cost of the expedition should be paid out of the Egyptian tribute or by the bondholders, in whose interests it had been undertaken, and finally moved the reduction

of the vote by two-thirds of its amount, leaving only the cost of the medical department and the nurses to be defrayed out of the public exchequer. A number of Radicals followed Mr. Labouchere, who found himself ably supported by Mr. Finch Hatton, the newly-elected Conservative member for South Lincolnshire, who, from personal knowledge of Egypt, declared that the fellaheen were in favour of an English protectorate, that in India we had ample experience and success in the government of Mahommedans, and that if the Khedive had been supported at the proper moment there would have been no war.

In the interval between the adjournment of the debate on the incomplete vote and its resumption, General Gordon's demand to have Zebehr Pasha, a notorious slave-dealer, appointed Governor of Khartoum became known. On being pressed by representatives of all parties, including Mr. John Morley, Mr. Laing and Mr. Forster, to give the views of the Government on this rumour, Lord Hartington said: "The objections to such an appointment must be obvious to the Committee, and I can assure the Committee that no one can be more surprised than the Government were when the first suggestion was made of such a course, and when it first appeared that General Gordon was contemplating its adoption. The more obvious the objections are, the more necessary it is that her Majesty's Government should satisfy themselves fully as to the reasons which have induced him to make such a recommendation, as to the reasons which have induced him to think that Zebehr Pasha under the circumstances would pursue an altered course of conduct, and what are the certain guarantees which, in General Gordon's opinion, render it safe in the interests of humanity that such an appointment should be made. We have, of course, asked from General Gordon full explanations on that point, and as soon as those explanations have been received and have been considered by the Government, of course the Government will lose no time in coming to a decision. I can assure the Committee that the suggestion has received no countenance from her Majesty's Government. On the contrary, we have expressed our surprise and the strong objection that we feel to make any such appointment. We are anxious—most anxious—that General Gordon should as rapidly as possible complete his task and return from Khartoum, and from the dangerous and critical position which, of course, we are aware he occupies so long as he is at Khartoum. Yet far better, in our opinion, than any such arrangement as that which he appears to have contemplated would it be that General Gordon should remain a longer time to complete the work himself, than that he should receive the assistance of or leave the succession to an objectionable agent."

After an admission that some modification of the Law of Liquidation might become inevitable, Lord Hartington went on to express his objections to the policy advocated by some—that of announcing our intention to maintain the occupation and

protectorate of Egypt for a definite term of years. Any confidence based upon such a declaration would, he argued, necessarily be continually diminishing during the term, and would ultimately be a vanishing quantity. "I admit," he said, "that our duty is to remain in Egypt until a stable government is established there, which can rest upon its own foundation, and which would inspire confidence not only in the people of that country, but also in those whose presence is so necessary there as furnishing the capital and the energy requisite for the development of the resources of Egypt." As to another plan suggested—that of substituting English officers for the Egyptian officers of State—he very much doubted its wisdom. The government of Egypt by English officials would be to the entire exclusion of Egyptians from positions of trust and responsibility, and it would bring into use a system which would absolutely and for ever exclude the possibility of native administration. Whenever a system of that kind, resting upon the foundation of British administration in all important offices of the State, is withdrawn, the whole must fall away.

Sir S. Northcote said, at the outset, that the Opposition could not support the amendment, and while regarding Lord Hartington's speech as in some respects a new departure, he regretted to find that the Government still continued to close their eyes to the critical state of affairs in Egypt. They were still too anxious to build a bridge for their own retreat, and they did not realize how deeply the national credit would suffer nor what complications would occur if we failed in the task which we had undertaken in Egypt. The Government had engaged to maintain tranquillity in Egypt, and by means of the Khedive and his Government; but were they going to strengthen the administration or to control it? There were signs that the system was crumbling under their hands, and unless something was done to secure confidence, there would be chronic anarchy in Egypt.

Mr. Labouchere's amendment, on a division, was negatived by 178 to 13, and the Army vote was agreed on; and in the same evening, in spite of further hostile divisions, the Government likewise obtained a supplementary vote of 147,200*l.* for the Navy.

But Mr. Labouchere was not satisfied with this defeat. Two days later the Government, being sorely pressed for time, was forced to ask for a Saturday sitting (March 16) to vote the Supplementary Estimates (Civil Services) of the fast closing financial year. On the motion that the Speaker should leave the chair, Mr. Ashmead Bartlett again brought forward the question of the Egyptian policy of the Government, attributing the present situation to their numerous changes of front and to the dominant ideas of surrender and retreat which had characterised them all. To abandon the Soudan to slavery and barbarism, he contended, would lead to renewed conflicts and massacres, and the only mode of restoring order and developing civilisation in the Soudan was to appoint a British Governor-General.

Mr. Labouchere thereupon at once rose from the opposite side of the House, and in a speech which repudiated that proposal as a "policy of grab," he inveighed in bitter terms against the Government and their new departure. The policy of "rescue and retire" and the "small service of humanity" had been abandoned for one of massacre and "worship of Moloch." He asked for some light to be thrown on the rumours of a march to Berber, and the constant changes of policy attributed to General Gordon, and concluded by moving that the necessity for the great loss of British and Arab life occasioned by our military operations had not been made apparent. Mr. Richard, in seconding the amendment, recorded his indignant protest against the butchery in the Soudan, and congratulated himself on the opposition which he had always offered to the Egyptian expedition.

The rumour of an understanding between the Conservatives and the Independent Radicals at once arose, although there was nothing in common between the starting point or the aim of the first two speakers. Lord E. Fitzmaurice, speaking on behalf of the Government, declined to admit that General Gordon was in any immediate danger, and assured Mr. Labouchere that General Graham's instructions did not permit him to advance to Berber; whilst the control of the Red Sea ports, which the Government had in view, was as necessary for the suppression of the slave trade as for the protection of commercial interests. Lord E. Fitzmaurice found himself in the somewhat invidious position of apologist for the Ministry, for during a great part of the sitting the Cabinet Ministers were all absent at a Council meeting. It was thus not without reason that Mr. Bourke was able to complain that the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs had not given the House a scrap of information as to the future policy of the Government, which he thought more than ever necessary, as every step they had taken had been marked by bloodshed and carnage. He had no faith in the success of the Ministerial policy for stopping the slave trade in the Soudan after its legalisation at Khartoum, nor did he believe that they would restore peace and tranquillity to Egypt. The House ought to have some further information as to the policy which General Gordon was carrying out, and looking to the certainty that irritating discussions on Egypt such as this would be constantly raised, and that legislation would be difficult while the public mind was agitated, the Government had better appeal to the country whether or not they ought to change their Egyptian policy.

Another phase of independent but bellicose Radicalism was exhibited by Mr. Cowen, who, in a vigorous speech, twitted the Radical party with the responsibility they had incurred by their want of manliness when they shrank from opposing the Egyptian expedition at its origin. He asserted that if the Government did not mean to remain in the Soudan the last two battles had been unmitigated murder. Was there no blood-guiltiness in this, he asked, and were the declarations of Midlothian mere "cant"?

Mr. Gladstone, he pointed out, was fulfilling his own prediction that the occupation of Egypt would lead us to the establishment of a North African empire, and while the Government were protesting against annexation, they had, in fact, annexed the country, and taken possession of the entire government.

For six hours the debate went on these lines, the Ministry at length being represented by Sir C. Dilke, from whom no further clue of the policy of the Government could be extracted, but who let fall the ominous remark that it was their intention to carry on the business of the country as long as they could, and that, if they were prevented, they would appeal to the country, not only on the question of their foreign policy, but also on the Bills which were now blocked by the tactics of their opponents. Mr. John Morley, Mr. Cowen's colleague in the representation of Newcastle, and a much more consistent supporter of the Government, spoke out very plainly the views of many who had so far kept silence, when he expressed his regret at the reticence of the Government in regard to the evacuation of the Soudan, and asked for some further information as to what General Gordon was to do at Khartoum. The Government, he feared, were in danger of mistaking a delusion for public opinion, and he protested that he would not go a step further on the road which the Government were pursuing unless he was told where it would lead to.

Lord Hartington, however, was firm in his determination to give no clue as to the intentions of the Government, and characterised the debate as a surprise planned by the Opposition. A division was then taken, when Mr. Labouchere's motion was defeated by 111 to 94, a majority of 17 for the Ministry, and so indecisive was this victory that the Conservatives began to hope that another time fortune would incline to their side. A "scene," moreover, followed the declaration of the numbers, and the Home Secretary (Sir W. Harcourt) was severely taken to task by Sir S. Northcote and others for having said in an undertone to one of his colleagues, "So their dirty trick has not succeeded."

Twelve hours later the House was still sitting, the long hours of the night having been employed in discussing with wearisome iteration some Irish votes and the misdeeds of Irish officials of every grade, especially of Captain Plunket; and it was close upon six o'clock on Sunday morning that the House adjourned—without having got through a third of the votes which the Government were so desirous to pass.

Yet, although the Ministry were able to show a strong front to the discontented of their own party, this defeat of the Radical left wing was promptly followed by rumours of dissension in the Cabinet; but it was asserted that the views of the Radical members of the Cabinet were diametrically opposed to those put forward by their unofficial exponents. Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Chamberlain, and, it was added, Lord Hartington were in favour of a forward policy in Egypt, and urged that the equivocal position which England held

in the eyes of Europe should give place to a definite declaration of her purpose, followed by the proof that she was prepared to hold to that purpose in spite of the carpings of other Continental Powers. Mr. Gladstone's temporary absence from the Cabinet meetings (due to his indisposition) was at once magnified into a hesitation on his part to decide between the two sections. However true this may have been momentarily, no open schism ensued, and for the remainder of the Session the Cabinet appeared as a cordially united body. The Conservatives, however, had gathered from Sir C. Dilke's speech that under certain circumstances a dissolution might be brought about. Rightly or wrongly, moreover, their leaders had come to the conclusion that a dissolution would be advantageous to their party; and they consequently were acting within their rights in forcing, if possible, the Government to this end. The open revolt of a certain section of the Radical party from the Ministerial policy raised these hopes still higher, and ingenuity on both sides was taxed to frame resolutions hostile to the Government which both Radicals and Conservatives might support. For a time, however, a constant fire of questions was directed each afternoon at the Treasury Bench, the object of each being to extract some definite statement from one or other member of the Government on which a hostile resolution could be made to hang. Lord Hartington, who for some time represented his leader, was wary and watchful; but in a great measure his reticence was the inevitable outcome of ignorance, for in consequence of the cutting of the telegraph wires little news was obtainable from the interior of the Soudan; and at length (March 24) Lord Hartington declared that, until further information had been received from General Gordon, it would be impossible for him to make any statement with reference to the Government policy in the Soudan. In spite, however, of this reticence, which the opponents of the Government attributed to divided counsels, Lord E. Fitzmaurice, in reply to Lord R. Churchill (March 25), allowed it to be understood that the third attack upon Osman Digma by General Graham, of which the news had come to hand, was not merely the protection of Suakim, but the "opening up of intercourse with Berber"; but a few minutes afterwards the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs explained that the object of this desired intercourse was to bring the Sheiks into communication with the British commander.

It was not probable that the Opposition would throw away the opportunity thus afforded them of attacking the halting policy and unintelligible attitude of the Government; and a promise was at length extracted from Lord Hartington that he would fully explain the state of affairs in Egypt before the House separated for the Easter recess. Meanwhile the Opposition lost no opportunity of cross-examining the Government as to the government of the Eastern Soudan, the relations to be maintained with the Western Soudan and between the Soudan and the Egyptian Government,

the actual position of General Gordon, and of the intentions of the Government towards that officer. Mr. Gladstone replied very briefly (April 3) to the effect that the Government, not having yet received General Gordon's report as to the best means of withdrawing from the Soudan, they did not think the moment had arrived for ordering him peremptorily to withdraw. General Gordon had full authority to return if he thought his task impossible; but no information had been received from him which suggested that he was in danger or unable to withdraw. As the other parts of Sir Stafford Northcote's question involved military considerations, it devolved on Lord Hartington to speak at some length on that aspect of the situation. The Secretary for War began by remarking that there were many things in the question of the leader of the Opposition which could not and ought not to be answered. With regard to General Gordon's request to have Zebehr Pasha sent up to Khartoum as his successor, the Government thought that the General overrated the danger to Egypt from the Mahdi's operations, and underrated the risk of establishing Zebehr at Khartoum. They had, therefore, declined to accede to that recommendation, and had requested him to remain in Khartoum as long as necessary to carry out the line of policy originally agreed upon. As yet they had no information as to the effect of that refusal on General Gordon's mind, or how far it would modify his plans and movements. As to the suggestion said to have emanated from General Gordon that troops should be sent to Wady Halfa, that was made in connection with the despatch of Zebehr Pasha. General Gordon had never asked for troops to be sent to him, and when he went out he well understood—and it was repeated over and over again—that he must accomplish his mission with the resources on the spot, that the British Government would not undertake the responsibility of an expedition to Khartoum, and the Government had no knowledge that he had ever asked or looked for British troops, or considered them necessary. The latest accounts from him were of a more satisfactory character, and he said that as the Nile rose he expected to be able to give an account of the rebels; and, considering this and the condition of the country between Berber and Khartoum, the Government had come to the conclusion not to send a force to Berber, which could be of no use to anybody. There was no abandonment of General Gordon in the case, but at the present time, with the knowledge the Government possessed of the views and position of General Gordon, they could not say what measures might have to be taken with regard to his safety. The time had not come when General Gordon could be said to have failed, nor did the Government think they were called on to take military measures for establishing a government in the Soudan. As to Suakim, Major Chermside had instructions to enter into negotiations with the friendly chiefs; and as to the financial position and the general question of Egypt, the Government could not

undertake to make any statement, though he repeated that they fully accepted their responsibility.

These explanations were at once held to be unsatisfactory by the Opposition, and Sir S. Northcote, after a brief pause, rose to move the adjournment of the House, "on a definite matter of urgent public policy—namely, the present policy of Her Majesty's Government in relation to affairs of Egypt." The motion, in spite of some cries, having been supported by the whole Opposition, Sir S. Northcote explained at some length the reasons which forced him to take this step. He did not complain so much of the reticence of the Government on points where they thought it advisable, as of their desire to avoid responsibility, and their repeated attempts to throw it on to other shoulders—the fault by which their whole policy was tainted and which had been productive of so much mischief. Mr. Gladstone at once rose to reply, and, in the opinion of competent judges, rarely in recent years did he display with so much brilliancy and effect the vast and diversified resources of his eloquence. In force of expression, in debating skill, and in overflowing energy of spirit Mr. Gladstone reached almost the level of the highest oratorical achievements of his prime. He reminded some of those who listened to him, and who could carry back their memories for close upon thirty years, of the part he played in the heated and passionate discussions on the China War. The Prime Minister's speech produced upon the House of Commons, which has not often had an opportunity of hearing him in this mood of magnificent wrath, a profound, though probably not a permanent, effect. The Opposition, who had risen up as accusers, found themselves arraigned as culprits, and driven to find excuses for a line of conduct which was described as obstructive and unconstitutional. He pointed out that this was the seventeenth night devoted to the discussion of the affairs of Egypt, although the Government had from the very first day of the Session, in the speech from the Throne, explained their views and policy. Since then they had been busy in examining the financial position of Egypt, in regulating the relations of that country with the Porte and the European Powers. He therefore denounced these repeated discussions in Parliament as mischievous in every way. And he added, "I should not, perhaps, say too much, though I venture to give it as an opinion at this moment that there is infinitely less to fear from the Mahdi and his friends than we had reason, and not without grounds, to apprehend during the months that followed the defeat of Hicks Pasha. I say this great advantage is already realized; but until we know something of General Gordon's plans, and what substitute he may have found for his proposal about Zebehr, or what measures he intends to pursue, I shall entirely decline to share the irresponsible declarations of the right hon. gentleman. I almost venture to appeal to some of the gentlemen who sit behind him, when I say that this premature assertion by the leader of the Opposition that the plans of General

Gordon have failed is mischievous to the best interests of Egypt. I have said that one of the greatest difficulties in this case is the number of cross and conflicting interests you have to deal with." Endorsing Sir Wilfrid Lawson's saying that the action of the British Government simply meant the promotion of the interests of foreign bondholders, Mr. Gladstone continued—"You read extracts from some foreign newspapers that are astonished at our deadness, and that speak of the demand that public duty makes upon us. Sir, when I hear these extracts I hear them as testimonies that we have not been taken in, and that we are not willing to be made the instruments of those who, for the sake of the millions sterling that have been invested in Egypt, are endeavouring, by every means they can employ, to bring the people of England blindfold into the assumption of immense responsibilities which no man can measure, and with regard to which I will say this—we will not undertake to say whether the people of England are to assume them or not—this great nation will determine that question for itself—but this we will say, they shall not assume them without knowing what they are about—they shall not assume them blindfold. You may quote your foreign press, with every wire that governs the action of a portion of it pulled by those who are connected with this great pecuniary interest; it is not wonderful that they should act in this sense, because what could be more comfortable or satisfactory to them than that, having already profited largely by the intervention of England, they should secure by it fifteen or twenty millions more? What could be more satisfactory to them, there being no other consequence to be apprehended except the imposition of a terrific burden upon the people of England and the undertaking of responsibilities of which I am certainly inclined to take a very serious measure?" Turning then to the perhaps hidden reason of the anxiety displayed by the Opposition in the affairs of a far-off half-civilized continent, Mr. Gladstone contrasted the present tactics with those adopted by their predecessors in 1831-2, when questions much nearer home, like the French Revolution and the Belgian Revolution, were agitating men's minds—questions ten times more formidable for the people of England than the questions now raised in Egypt and the Soudan. As, therefore, there was no ostensible reason for the conduct of the Opposition in renewing these discussions, Mr. Gladstone denounced it as a farce. "That is the interpretation which, in the legitimate exercise of judgment, I apply to the acts of those who are before me. I have pointed out that this mode of proceeding is totally without precedent; and that the statement made is mischievous to the public interests, and calculated distinctly and undeniably to weaken the hands of the British Government, and likewise of every man acting for it in Egypt; and I cannot withhold the expression of this opinion, that the proceedings thus taken and the debates thus constantly renewed are out of all proportion to the pressure and urgency of

the question, and have the effect of offering immense obstruction to important public business. These things, I say, are done, and they are done for some purpose which it is not necessary for me to define, and which has not, up to this time, been avowed." After a strenuous denial on the part of some prominent members of the Opposition of the tactics ascribed to them, the discussion was for the time closed by Lord J. Manners, who said that the Prime Minister, by the wild fury and the discursive character of his speech, had invited an extension of the discussion for which no warrant was given by Sir S. Northcote's definite inquiry. As to General Gordon, his mission had certainly failed as a pacific mission, and the real apprehensions entertained by the Government were visible in the tone of Lord Hartington's speech. Mr. Gladstone's reference to 1831-32 was absurd, and the Opposition, he said, convinced that these motives would be understood, would renew these discussions as often as they might be necessary to compel the Government to treat this House and the country with candour.

Outside the House of Commons the anxiety as to the fate of General Gordon and the affairs of Egypt seemed to take greater hold of the public mind than Mr. Gladstone was prepared to admit, and it was with very general approbation that Lord Hardwicke on the following evening (April 4) brought the matter before the House of Lords, and inquired whether it was intended to take any steps for the relief of General Gordon. He strongly censured the Government for the course they had pursued and were pursuing in those quarters, and expressed the opinion that no plenipotentiary to a beleaguered town or an unfriendly State had ever been worse treated than General Gordon had been by Her Majesty's Ministers. He accused them of having committed an outrage when they bombarded Alexandria, and of having endeavoured to shirk responsibility since. Lord Napier (of Magdala) gave it as his opinion that there was no insuperable difficulty in the march of English troops from Suakim to Khartoum, and urged the Government to take that route into consideration. Replying first to Lord Hardwicke, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs declared that, as at present advised, the Government were not prepared to send a great military expedition into the heart of the Soudan. In no part of the instructions given by them to the General was there the slightest promise that he would be backed up by a military expedition. He confessed he had much more fears for the gallant officer's life during the first few days that he was in the Soudan than he entertained at present. The Government could not act on irresponsible statements, and they had had no demand for troops from General Gordon, whose communications to the Government were reassuring. With regard to the military question raised by Lord Napier, and admitting his very great authority upon such matters, Lord Granville confessed that the prospect of an expedition to Khartoum, as sketched, was not encouraging; and he pointed to the fact that

the war conducted by Lord Napier himself in Abyssinia cost four times more than had been estimated, as showing how much more difficult such expeditions were than even great military authorities anticipated. As to the question itself, his answer was that there was scarcely a military point which could arise in reference to the Soudan on which the Government had not consulted the military authorities within the last few months.

The Marquess of Salisbury led the discussion into another channel, raising the question of how far the Government was justified in withholding from the public all General Gordon's communications. He repeated his charges of indecision against the Government, whom he accused of having no plan, and expressed his apprehension that in the case of Khartoum, as on previous occasions, help would be too late, and that Parliament was about to adjourn for the Easter recess without any information as to the future. The Government no doubt thought that any further vindication of their policy in Parliament was for the time superfluous, but during the Easter recess Sir W. Harcourt, in the course of his speech to his constituents at Derby (April 16), vigorously defended the action of the Government, and endeavoured to remove from the public mind the idea which had been rapidly spreading that they were neglectful of General Gordon or careless of the issue of his expedition. "No praise," he said, "can be too high for that illustrious man who went forth, like David, to attempt to relieve the garrisons in the Soudan. I think there is nothing more culpable than the attempts which are made to use the name of that hero as an engine of political attack. Of course, the Government of England, whether it be this Government or any Government, will make every effort in their power to support him. I am happy to say—though of course it is difficult at this distance, and with such obstacles to communication, to speak positively upon such a matter—that the last accounts which I have seen from General Gordon are certainly not accounts which intimate that he considers he is in any personal danger at Khartoum. But, of course, one cannot but feel anxious until his task is accomplished and he has returned to his native country."

Lord R. Churchill, at Birmingham (April 18), showed very considerable scepticism as to the crusading zeal of the Government, and declared his conviction that the policy of postponement would be maintained. He had, however, no doubt that in the course of a few months we should have to send a large military force to Khartoum, either to support General Gordon, or to rescue him, or to avenge his death. We should have to take over the Egyptian administration because we had, by our policy, utterly and hopelessly destroyed the native ministry; and we should have to make proposals to Europe for the settlement of Egyptian finance, and for the abolition of international tribunals. These proposals to the Powers of Europe would have to be made in Congress, and if we were prepared to give to the Powers of Europe a guarantee for the

preservation of order in Egypt and a guarantee to some extent for Egyptian indebtedness, he made no doubt whatever that we might get from Europe a mandate that would permit us to protect British interests in the East.

In like manner, but in still more scathing language, Lord Salisbury, at Manchester (April 17), denounced the dilatory policy of the Government. After each unexpected catastrophe they acted with spasmodic energy, of which the force was soon expended. They neglected prestige, which alone enabled men without forces to act; they preached peace and concession, and then were compelled to slaughter thousands without reason or justification. Lord Salisbury expressed his conviction that our troops would remain in Egypt for quite as long a period as politicians usually concern themselves with; and that a change of policy in that country was the wish of nine Englishmen out of ten. "It was not, however, a policy that was wanted, but a workman to carry it out."

Events were not slow in giving some colour to Lord Salisbury's strictures. The recommendation signed by Sir E. Baring and Sir E. Wood for the immediate despatch of a joint British and Egyptian force for the relief of Berber reached this country just as Parliament reassembled, and Mr. Gladstone was forthwith (April 24) closely questioned as to the intentions of the Government. He declined to admit that even the fall of Berber would in any way increase General Gordon's risks, with regard to whom he stated, on information which he declined to make public, that "there was no military or other danger at Khartoum." He admitted, however, that the country felt "a profound interest, and likewise a strong sense of obligation dependent upon it, with regard to the safety of General Gordon." That feeling, Mr. Gladstone assured the House, the Government had shared from the very first, and had been "careful to put themselves in a position to fulfil their obligation in a sense in which they believe the country, in common with themselves, will recognise it." Meanwhile the imminent insolvency of Egypt was being pressed upon the attention of the Foreign Office by those Powers whose subjects claimed, amongst other things, indemnities for the losses caused by the Alexandrian bombardment and subsequent riots. The charges thus incurred, as well as the pressing needs of the administration, rendered the raising of 8,000,000*l.* imperative. Without some modification of the Law of Liquidation any loan was impossible, and little surprise therefore was expressed when it became known that Lord Granville had issued invitations to the fourteen Powers interested in Egyptian finance to attend a Conference in London. The news which day by day arrived from foreign capitals showed that the English Cabinet had been for some time sounding European statesmen on the question, and much negotiation had obviously been gone through before Mr. Gladstone found himself in a position to announce (May 1) to the House of Commons that the proposal for a Conference had been accepted by the Powers, France only

expressing a desire (not imposing a condition) that there should be some preliminary communications between her Ministers and the Cabinet of St. James's. The actual terms of the invitation to the Conference addressed to the Powers Mr. Gladstone stated were:—"It appears to Her Majesty's Government that, to meet the charges necessary for the good government of the country, and to fulfil the engagement already incurred by the Egyptian Exchequer, some change in the Law of Liquidation is required. Her Majesty's Government would therefore propose that the Conference should meet in London or at Constantinople to determine whether such a change is necessary, and what should be its exact nature."

Although the difficulties raised by France from the very outset were naturally minimised by Mr. Gladstone in his public remarks, there can be but little doubt that the Ministry must have foreseen the possibility that the Powers, once in conference, would either force Lord Granville to explain his intentions with regard to the future government of Egypt, or would interpose such objections to purely financial proposals as to render the labours of the delegates nugatory. Warnings to this effect were issued to the Ministry by the organs of all parties; and in the House Mr. Gladstone was pressed to say whether prearranged exclusion of all subjects except finance had been made a condition of accepting the invitation, or if the Conference insisted upon raising other questions the English representatives would at once withdraw. After taking time to consider his reply, Mr. Gladstone declared (May 8) that Her Majesty's Government did not intend to introduce any matter other than finance, and that the introduction of any other matter "would be equivalent to the calling together a new Conference." On the following day he took a step backwards by admitting that he could not undertake that the Conference should "forego the opportunity of raising a new question at a given time," but on the more important point of the basis of the instructions to be given to the English representatives not a word was said.

It was therefore scarcely surprising that a fresh Vote of Censure should seem to the Conservatives a hopeful campaigning ground, especially as the sudden cessation of all news from General Gordon gave rise to the worst apprehensions. Sir M. Hicks-Beach accordingly gave notice of a motion; and, after some slight demur, Mr. Gladstone consented to find a day for its discussion. The terms of the motion, which were framed so as to attract support from various independent sections, ran thus:—"That this House regrets to find the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government has not tended to promote the success of General Gordon's mission, and that even such steps as be necessary to secure his personal safety are delayed." In moving this Vote of Censure (May 12), Sir M. Hicks-Beach reminded the House of the assurance given originally by the Prime Minister that General Gordon was to have a "free hand" in the Soudan in order to carry out the Government programme of "rescue and retire," and he contrasted this promise

with the repeated interference of the Government with the General's plans. Whilst they were urging the use of only pacific means in one part of the Soudan, they were pressing forward warlike movements in another, and by this means effectually neutralised all Gordon's pacific intentions. Sir M. Hicks-Beach was very far from admitting that Gordon's mission was capable of pacific solution, and believed that a resort to force might be required. To this possibility the Government were not blind, yet, in almost the last telegram (April 23) despatched to General Gordon, they accused him of a desire to undertake military operations beyond the scope of his mission, and at variance with the pacific policy of evacuating the Soudan. When, after General Graham's victories, the Government refused to send the desired troops to Berber, they left full discretion to Gordon to remain at Khartoum or to retire by any route available. This offer Sir M. Hicks-Beach qualified as the most disgraceful suggestion ever made by a British Government to a British soldier or a Christian gentleman; and he was not surprised at the strong language used by Gordon in his reference to the indelible disgrace which would fall on the British Government if the garrisons of Sennaar, Kassala, Berber, and Dongola were left to their fate. The Government had not dared to resent this unparalleled language of a subordinate because the country fully endorsed it.

The House was crowded and the public expectant to hear Mr. Gladstone's reply, which it was hoped would foreshadow some new and more definite policy in Egypt. For some days previous to the debate he had declined to give any hint of the intentions of the Government towards General Gordon, on the ground that all such communications should be reserved until the Vote of Censure was under discussion; and it was therefore with no slight feeling of disappointment that the House listened to a speech which, though full of subtleties of argument and denunciation of his opponents, seemed purposely contrived to avoid any plain recognition of the responsibilities of the moment. He led away the debate from the points chiefly brought forward by Sir M. Hicks-Beach by ridiculing his suggestions, which, he maintained, were neither more nor less than an immediate dispatch of British troops to Khartoum, without any regard to climate, the supply of water, the state of the river, &c.; and the putting down of the Mahdi, which meant the reconquest of the Soudan. Examining the allegations of the speech, he denied that it was against his will that the General had received a commission from the Khedive, or that the Government had absolutely negatived the visit to the Mahdi or to the Equatorial region. General Gordon had, early in the year, expressed his gratitude for the manner in which he had been supported, and if in April he wrote the strong telegrams which had been published, he had not at that time received the later telegrams from Her Majesty's Government. It was true that the Government had declined to send troops to Wady Halfa and to Berber, but they had acted on military advice, and bearing in mind not merely the

great military risk but the small military advantage which would have resulted. Gordon, he said, had never asked for British soldiers, he had never stated that he could not leave Khartoum, and he had never represented that he was in any danger from without. In support of this contention, and to illustrate his statement that Gordon was in no military danger, he read the telegrams received from Gordon, including the one just received from Dongola, describing the state of affairs at Khartoum. He admitted to the full the obligations of the Government to General Gordon, and by the despatch of April 23 he conceived that the Government had entered into a covenant with him that on reasonable proof of danger he would be assisted. The country would never grudge any reasonable effort for the protection of its agents; but it was the duty of the Government to consider the treasure, the blood, and the honour of the country, and the circumstances of the time, the season, the climate, and the military difficulties. Conscious of what their obligations were, they would continue to use their best endeavours to fulfil them, unmoved by the threats and the captious criticisms of the Opposition.

Sir George Campbell and Mr. F. Buxton, independent supporters of the Government, did not conceal their impatience with General Gordon for not having anticipated the wishes of the Cabinet and retired at once from Khartoum; but Mr. Laing, from the same side of the House, reluctantly separating himself from his party, refused to be responsible for the disgrace and disaster with which the country was threatened by this crowning ignominy—the desertion of Gordon. He regarded the situation as one of extreme gravity, and he traced it to the same causes which had done so much mischief in Egypt—the determination of the Government not to look facts in the face and to substitute phrases for reality. If the same policy were pursued at the Conference, the Government would be landed in more serious financial straits; and after Mr. Gladstone's speech he almost feared that the Egyptian business would be the first chapter in the decline of the British Empire.

On behalf of the front Opposition Bench Mr. Gibson commented severely on the disappointing speech of the Prime Minister, which, he said, contained no clear recognition of responsibility and no intimation of policy more decided than this, that at some time—the proper time—something would be done. General Gordon's mission was twofold—to withdraw the garrisons and to reconstitute the country; and though it was essentially a pacific mission, it involved military contingencies. So far from having assisted him, the Government had done everything to thwart the mission. Their military operations had served no useful purpose; they had exasperated the Mahdi, and had entirely destroyed the sole chance of a pacific issue of Gordon's mission. He condemned in strong language the ambiguous attitude now assumed by the Government towards Gordon, and asserted that the Vote of Censure conveyed the opinion of the civilised world.

Lord E. Fitzmaurice, in a very elaborate defence of his department, showed that Gordon's mission was the peaceful evacuation of the Soudan, and that there was no evidence for assuming that, even if left for some months in Khartoum, Gordon's position was desperate. The whole of a second day (thirteen hours) was given up to the debate on the Vote of Censure, but until Lord Randolph Churchill rose the proceedings were lifeless. As if to show that the reconciliation between himself and the front Opposition Bench was complete, he paid Sir M. Hicks-Beach marked compliments on the eloquence of his speech, declared that it was the duty of the Government to rescue not only the four named garrisons of the Soudan, but all the garrisons where Christian or Egyptian troops were to be found in those parts, and expressed himself strongly in favour of a British Protectorate, open and avowed, over Egypt. Mr. W. E. Forster once more aroused the ire of the independent and official Liberals by again assuming the rôle of candid friend of the Ministry. He showed that long before Mr. Gladstone had admitted that the object of his policy had been twofold—to extricate the garrisons and to reconstitute the Government of Egypt—Lord Granville, in deciding in favour of the abandonment of the Soudan, in opposition to the wishes of the Egyptian Government, had constituted England the responsible Power in those regions, and had acknowledged her responsibility. Recent events seemed to point to a strange forgetfulness of duties. When the selection of Zebehr by Gordon was vetoed in Downing Street, it was the duty of the Government to suggest some other plan. General Gordon offered his resignation, and, although it was not accepted, he was left unsupported and surrounded by his enemies. If this mission to Western Soudan were a wholly pacific one, the Government had to show for what cause they relied solely upon warlike means on the Eastern coast. Gordon evidently thought those troops were to go to his rescue, and there were touching accounts of scouts being sent out to look for them in his helplessness, or at least his want of support. As to the last message to Gordon being a "covenant," it could not be so interpreted. "If he does get it," asked Mr. Forster, "in what position will it probably find him at Khartoum? Struggling for his life; and not merely for his own life, but for the lives of all those who have been entrusted to him. It is quite possible that, after all, he may succeed, and that before October comes you may find that his success will be so clear that, for very shame's sake, you will have to support him, and take, or try to take, some credit for what he has done." Preparations for General Gordon's support, if they had been made some time ago, would, Mr. Forster urged, have sufficed. It was just possible, though hardly probable, that if those preparations were made at once, and if General Gordon himself could be informed that British power was behind him, an expedition would not be necessary. But if the policy were adopted of giving no hope, no prospect of such an expedition, but only holding it out if

certain information was obtained, then all the tribes would rise, and every man who hated Egyptian rule—every man who feared what the Mahdi or his followers would do—would rally round the standard of the Mahdi's friends.

In reply, Lord Hartington expressed his regret that Mr. Forster should have thought it necessary to make a bitter and highly prepared attack upon the sincerity of his former chief, and his surprise that Mr. Forster's well-known love for peace should always be found exhibiting itself in the utterance of trumpet calls to war. Lord Hartington then set himself to remove as far as possible the untoward effect produced by Mr. Gladstone's speech on the previous evening. He denied that by it was intended the abandonment of General Gordon, though he expressly asserted that the Government were under no obligation toward the garrisons to use military force for their rescue. He then went on to explain more fully the real character of Gordon's mission, which the Government had done its utmost to support. He denied the assertion that events around Suakim had exasperated the Mahdi, and that the road to Berber might have been opened by General Graham's force. He assured the House that the Government would not postpone until October considering the means of helping Gordon, but they declined to be hurried into an expedition for the relief of a stronghold 1,900 miles distance from Cairo at a period of the year when the journey presented the greatest difficulties. If the necessity arose, and the practicability were demonstrated, Lord Hartington expressed his belief that the country would grudge no sacrifice to save the life and honour of General Gordon. Another candid friend of the Government on this occasion also was Mr. Goschen, who asked if Ministers were serious when they allowed General Gordon to go alone, and without a policy in case he should fail in his enterprise. He pointed out, moreover, that although Gordon had not asked for troops to be sent to Khartoum, he had indicated various spots where he wished to have support. No attention had been paid to this request of a man who, above all others, knew what could be done with 200 or 300 English soldiers in such countries. Mr. Goschen, in conclusion, declared that he would entertain no doubt of the intention of the Government to send a relief expedition if Mr. Gladstone had announced it, but all that had been stated was, that it was necessary to have advice as to the necessity and practicability of an expedition. The necessity had already been proved, but we were still to wait, and there was no assurance that Gordon's life might not be sacrificed because Government would not accept the responsibility of the means by which it might be preserved. "It seems to me to be a deplorable and calamitous thing that we cannot discuss these most delicate and difficult questions without their being obscured by the smoke of the battle of party politics. The condition seems to have been broken that foreign affairs should have been taken out of the arena of party politics. Observe what is the result of the

change that has taken place. We have no more continuity of national will. We have nothing but a spasmodic policy, and we see ruinous quarrels between rival parties over these difficult questions of foreign affairs, which present an edifying spectacle to Europe, which is looking on to see what profit can be gained from these dissensions among ourselves."

The case on behalf of the Government was summed up in a masterly speech by Sir Charles Dilke, who commented on General Gordon's sudden change in his view as to his mission. The General had, without giving any hint of his intention, suddenly sent out troops to show his force, and said an expedition would be sent to attack the rebels. As to the cause of this sudden change the Government still had no information. Reference had been made to the moral effect of the announcement of an expedition, but this was an argument in favour of the pitiful policy of sham, to which the Government would not stoop. When the opportunity offered and the means were plain, measures would be taken to secure General Gordon's life without exposing thousands of British troops to useless risks.

The House then divided, and Sir M. Hicks-Beach was defeated by the somewhat narrow majority of 28—ayes 275, noes 303. Messrs. Forster and Goschen, in spite of their speeches, took no part in the division; but six other Liberals voted in the minority and thirty-one Home Rulers, whilst fifteen of their party supported the Government.

Side by side with the result of the debate on the second Vote of Censure, there appeared in the *Times* (May 14) a letter from Sir Samuel Baker, summing up the situation in Egypt, and expressing the views of a man who had had a wide experience of life in Central Africa, and whose personal acquaintance with General Gordon was most intimate. The debates in the House of Commons, he wrote, upon the conduct of Egyptian policy have awakened the British people to the actual situation, and have exhibited the lamentable position to which General Gordon has been cruelly abandoned by a Government upon which he depended for support. Hated and despised by the Egyptian people, who have lost all respect and confidence in British declarations, which have been falsified by inaction and prevarication, the English nation had forfeited *prestige*, and our reputation had been stained by a series of calamities, the result of a cowardly and vacillating administration in the affairs of Egypt. He earnestly urged that the crisis admitted of no delay, and called for determined and immediate action. The declaration of "abandonment" must be modified and a new one proclaimed, and preparations made for an expedition of 10,000 men as soon as the rise of the Nile would permit the navigation of the river from Cairo to Dongola, and southward to Berber and Khartoum. The immediate outcome, however, either of the debate or fresh consultations of the Cabinet was a despatch, addressed by Lord Granville

(May 17) to the *chargé d'affaires* at Cairo, directing him to inform General Gordon that, as the original plan for the evacuation of Khartoum was dropped, and as no aggressive operations against the Mahdi were contemplated, General Gordon should consider how best to remove himself and the Egyptian garrison from Khartoum, where the Soudanese were not in danger. As to how these orders were to be conveyed to General Gordon no suggestion was made; and inasmuch as the Government had been at this date without news of the General for upwards of six weeks, it seemed to many that Lord Granville's despatch was somewhat of the nature of a superfluous precaution.

With the vote, however, on the second Vote of Censure the interest in Egyptian affairs shifted to doings at home, and busied itself in discussing the probable results of the Conference. The satisfaction produced by the Ministerial statement (May 22), interpreted to signify that under no circumstances would the Dual Control be revived, gave way before the rumour that France was urging the establishment of an International or Multiple Control, from which the most disastrous results might be anticipated. To this form of control, provided it was limited to finance and took the form of an international audit of Egyptian accounts, it was said that the English Cabinet would not object. Moreover, according to the French papers, the matter might have been arranged on this basis, had not France insisted upon the English occupation coming to an end in two years, and that the International Control should commence at once, whilst England urged that a limit of five years was not more than sufficient for her troops and officials to effect the promised regeneration of Egypt. How far these rumours correctly reflected the negotiations going on between London and Paris Mr. Gladstone would not reveal; and on his being pressed (May 27) to say how far Parliament would be taken into council by the Government, either as to the separate arrangements with France or the general outcome of the Conference, all that he would promise was that the result of any common understanding with the Powers or with France should be communicated to Parliament before the meeting of the Conference, but he expressly declined to promise that Parliament should have an opportunity of expressing an opinion before the opening of the Conference.

In the interval of the Whitsuntide recess, however, this decision of the Government underwent some modification, and shortly after the reassembling of the Houses Mr. Gladstone announced (June 9) that the negotiations with France had reached a point which would shortly enable the Government to consult the Powers; and he went on to promise "that the House of Commons should have an opportunity of pronouncing upon the arrangement itself before anything was finally concluded, so as to bind the country." Lord Salisbury, meanwhile, had found at Devonport (June 4) the opportunity of explaining to a popular audience his views on the foreign policy of the Government. He charged the Ministry in

their conduct of foreign affairs rather with imbecility than with impolicy—of not having followed up with their whole heart whatever policy they took in hand. The Multiple Control or management of Egypt by the seven Great Powers of Europe, Lord Salisbury likened to the administration of the Great Western Railway by a council of delegates from all the other railways; and whilst utterly condemning the suggestion, he maintained that, if England retired, Egypt would be governed by some other nation. He insisted that we should retain paramount and exclusive power in that country. He urged that, British power in India resting ultimately upon the British sword, it was essential to maintain the prestige of that sword, and that if the Indian peoples saw Russia and France advancing in our despite, that prestige would be lost. He denied that Empire was a chimera, or Imperialism a sterile sentiment. It was a sentiment, but one that made every citizen greater and more effective in his own sphere:—"But it does more than this. Undoubtedly, we should avoid anything like an unnecessary, intermeddling, adventurous policy. But your Empire, if we mean it to live, must grow, must steadily grow. If it ceases to grow, it will begin to decay. That Empire rests not merely on the vain-glorious spirit of a hollow imagination; but it rests upon the sound basis of the extension of intercourse between the civilised and the uncivilised portion of the world; and it is the foundation and the necessary condition of that commercial prosperity and of that industrial activity which are the bread of life to millions of our people."

But it was not only by the Conservative leader and his party that the idea of the "Multiple Control" was repudiated. The *Times*, which throughout the year had separated itself on nearly every point from the Government policy, wrote (June 5) on the re-assembling of Parliament:—"Blunders are now in course of being consummated, which can be averted only by such an expression of the views of Parliament as shall shake Ministers out of that satisfied self-sufficiency which has so completely blinded them to the facts of the case and to the judgment of the country thereon. Negotiations with France involving a wanton and culpable abandonment of national rights are still going on, though, as Lord Granville anticipated on the eve of the adjournment, they may not have made much progress during the recess. Their general tenour is certainly what we have repeatedly described it as being, notwithstanding all expressions of real or affected incredulity. To place Egypt under the control of an international commission, to limit our occupation to a short term of years, to make our army while it lasts practically the servant of the European Powers, and to yield to France all the advantages which France would not spend a franc to win for herself, are the extraordinary aims of the Cabinet. We are simply bartering our position in Egypt and our standing in the eyes of Europe for some hypothetical French friendship."

The *Daily Telegraph*, which had on many occasions supported the Government in its course, was scarcely less frank in indicating the dangers attendant upon the course attributed to Lord Granville. "No negotiations," it wrote, "and no international discussions can emancipate the Cabinet from dealing with the Egyptian difficulty, such as it stands, and such as Ministers have made it. They, and only they, must take action, and take it quickly. No Multiple Control will ever be suffered to order about the soldiers of the Queen, nor will Parliament allow any early date to be fixed for their departure. Our Ministry have but to recognise the force of facts, and accept frankly and manfully the advantages together with the perplexities of our Egyptian Control, to find the latter vanishing and the former developing. The choice will lie between adopting frankly and finally the care and charge of Egypt, and seeing all the great measures of the session, together with the power and prospects of the Liberal party, wrecked on the rocks of an obstinate prepossession and an invincible self-will."

Almost simultaneously it was asserted, that on the reassembling of Parliament, representations were made to the "Whips" by many habitual Government supporters to the effect that their constituents held very strong opinions on the reported surrender of our position in Egypt. Without any attempt to dictate terms, Mr. Gladstone was given to understand that two great concessions to France would be followed by a serious Liberal defection. Whether there was any foundation for this rumour, which was repeated in various forms, matters but little, for its mere circulation brought from the *Daily News* (June 6), the apologist for Mr. Gladstone, a very prompt denial of the intentions attributed to him: "There is not the slightest intention, we feel well assured, to place Egypt under the control of any international commission, either while our occupation lasts, or after our occupation has come to an end. Yesterday it was rumoured that England would consent to act as the executive of a cosmopolitan, or international, or Multiple Control in Egypt, and that England would within a given time withdraw from Egypt, and leave that country to some sort of cosmopolitan, international, or Multiple Control. We think we may venture to assure our readers that neither idea represents any solid substance whatever. We think we can assure our readers that they need not have the slightest fear on this subject. Her Majesty's Government have not the remotest idea of acting in Egypt as the executive of any foreign Power or combination of foreign Powers. We believe we may go a little farther, and say that no foreign Power has ever expected anything of the kind, or hinted at such an expectation."

Nor were the openly acknowledged views of statesmen and political thinkers of various shades less clearly expressed. Earl Grey, in a letter to the *Times* about the same moment, pointed out the needlessness of any Conference on Egyptian finance. It would be necessary, he admitted, to obtain the consent of the European

Powers to an alteration in the Law of Liquidation, but this might have been done by merely communicating the English proposals to each Power separately. With the possible exception of France, they would one and all have accepted them, provided that any sacrifice of interest demanded of the bondholders had been compensated by an improvement in the security for the principal. Earl Grey's proposal was that England should undertake to assist the Khedive in defending the country and in meeting his financial difficulties in consideration of his binding himself, so long as he should receive such assistance, to conduct his government according to British advice. The military aid would be given by a British force; the financial aid by a British loan. This last expedient would be simpler and cheaper than a loan raised by the Khedive in the open market; while it would pledge England to no more, since no loan could be raised without a British guarantee at its back. The politicians who thought that our stay in Egypt need not be a long one would be cheered by the prospect of its coming to an end as soon as the Khedive felt himself strong enough to stand alone. Those who held that in one way or another Egypt must continue under our influence would be consoled by the reflection that the Khedive was never likely to be strong enough to stand alone. The majority of the Great Powers would find all that they really cared for secured by the British guarantee for the punctual discharge of the Khedive's obligations, and if their subjects got less interest on their capital, they would no longer see the capital itself the sport of every passing rumour and idle speculation. The only serious objection would come from France, and the more it was admitted that France has other than financial aims in Egypt, the more important it became that she should be given no foothold in the country. The measure of French indignation at being excluded from Egypt would be the measure of French intrigue if she were allowed to meddle in Egypt. Mr. Wilfrid Blunt, the adviser of Arabi, and the friend of the fellaheen, in the course of two important letters, urged that the interest of the Great Powers, other than England and France, in Egypt was really a financial interest, and they would only consider "how the estate could be best managed in the interest of the mortgagees."

Mr. Frederic Harrison, the most eloquent writer from the "Positivist" camp, had persistently preached that we ought to have left Egypt alone in the first instance, and that, not having done so, we ought to bring our interference to an end in as short a time as possible. The new departure of the Government aroused even his apprehensions, and in spite of his French sympathies he declared: "As foreign opinion now stands, England would be thwarted and attacked at every turn. . . . She could only secure agreement by consenting to impose on the people of Egypt burdens which would fill our people at home with shame." Criticism "dictated by national envy and selfishness. . . . is hard enough to bear from our disappointed rivals, but to endure it from our partners in

rule would be to court an open rupture. . . . Let us call other Powers to council when we have thoroughly matured a policy of our own and are perfectly prepared to carry it through. To call them into Egypt without this is to incur the guilt of all they may do, and most of what they do is sure to be evil."

For upwards of a fortnight the public at home and abroad was allowed unlimited license in forecasting the future. The imminent rupture of diplomatic intercourse between Paris and London, the despatch of Turkish troops to the Soudan, the loan of many millions to Egypt, the abandonment of the Conference, were a few amongst the many rumours in circulation which obtained credence for the moment. At length (June 23) Lord Granville and Mr. Gladstone communicated to Parliament the basis of the agreement upon which, after much hesitation, France consented to take part in the Conference. From the correspondence which had gone on between Lord Granville and M. Waddington it was clear that the mutual distrust which animated the press on both sides of the Channel was not shared by the diplomatists engaged. From the outset Lord Granville disclaimed the belief that the French would take the very grave step of entering Egypt when the British troops took their departure. The French ambassador, on the other hand, in a despatch (dated June 15), at once expressed his desire to remove two prejudices, widely spread in the English press, relative to the re-establishment of the Condominium and to the alleged military projects of France in Egypt. With regard to the former, he declared the Condominium to be dead beyond hope of revival, whilst as regarded the substitution of a French for the English garrison in Egypt, M. Waddington declared that the Government of the Republic was ready to give the most formal engagement on this point. "This determination was inspired by the confidence that Her Majesty's Government will not hesitate to confirm distinctly the solemn declarations made by them on repeated occasions, that they would do nothing to prejudice in any way the international situation in Egypt secured by treaties and firmans, and would evacuate the country when order should be re-established." To the invitation which was contained in this despatch Lord Granville replied on the following day, expressing his satisfaction that France practically endorsed the recommendations contained in his circular of January 3, 1883. He expressed his regret that circumstances had postponed the withdrawal of the British troops, and proposed to give a pledge that they should definitely quit the country early in 1888, "provided that the Powers are then of opinion that such withdrawal can then take place without risk to peace and order." Passing in review the various steps which had led to the establishment of the Anglo-French Control, the difficulties to which it had given rise, and the objections to its revival, Lord Granville went on to propose that a limited extension should be given to the Commission of the Caisse de la Dette Publique. The Commissioners of the Caisse would be consulted when the Budget for each year,

commencing with that for 1886, was in course of preparation. The Budget would be based, as far as possible, on the provisions of the normal Budget which Her Majesty's Government proposed to exhibit to the Conference—due allowance being made for any altered circumstances of the country. The Budget for each year being so prepared in consultation with the Commissioners, the latter would be empowered to veto during the year any proposed expenditure which would produce an excess on the Budget, except in cases of sudden emergency involving peril to peace and order. In the House of Commons Mr. Gladstone explained at greater length the functions of the Commissioners of the Caisse, who were to be four in number, presided over by an Englishman. There would no longer be, as under the Condominium, a general control exercised by the two Powers over Egyptian finance, nor would the Budgets be framed by the Commissioners of the Caisse, but these officials would be provided with sufficient information as to the financial proceedings of the Government of Egypt, backed up by an effective power of preventing excesses beyond the limit of the Budget. The British Government, moreover, engaged to prepare and propose a plan for the ultimate neutralisation of Egypt, to take effect immediately on the withdrawal of British troops from the country. In the House of Lords Earl Granville had travelled over the same ground, insisting that the power of putting a veto on any expenditure in excess of the amount specified in the Budget would be a strong weapon in the hands of the Commission, and at the same time would be a stimulus to the Egyptian Government to exercise economy. In order, moreover, to show with what freedom England entered the Conference, Lord Granville added: "If, as I trust will not be the case, for it would be a great disaster to all concerned, —if we do not arrive in Conference at a satisfactory settlement of the financial question, we shall entirely regain our liberty of action, and we must consider the position in which we shall be placed."

The criticisms provoked in both Houses by the statements of the Government hardly dealt with more than the surface of the question as presented by the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary; but the latter, in reply to questions from the Marquess of Salisbury, made some admissions, but more reservations, from which the Opposition drew the most unfavourable conclusions, especially when it came to be seen how divergent were the interpretations put upon the correspondence by Mr. Gladstone and M. Ferry. The Marquess of Salisbury, moreover, contended that the proposals of the Government seemed to contain much that was perilous to the interests of this country, and full of menace to the future peace of the world. In the despatch of Lord Granville he declared all the difficult points appeared to be covered by a studied ambiguity of language, which might be a convenient mode of evading present difficulties, but which would certainly not make the future more peaceful or more secure. There was the burning

question of what was to be done supposing that at the end of three years we found the circumstances not such as to permit of our evacuation. The language of the despatch seemed to leave it in doubt by what machinery we were to submit our wishes to the Powers, and left in doubt the question of how many of the Powers must we have the consent in order to justify us in remaining in Egypt. Again, there was that other burning question of the jurisdiction and functions of this new Multiple Control. He who has the power of the purse has power over the whole, and our policy must be subordinated to financial considerations. But the language in which the Caisse is authorised or empowered to veto the particular articles of the Budget was again couched in language of studied ambiguity, and that meant future controversy, and future controversy was dangerous to the peace of the world. Again, the whole of this arrangement, so carefully elaborated, evaded the main ground on which the whole of the negotiations were undertaken—it did not touch the financial portion. He did not understand for what considerations we had made these promises to France. And he pressed Lord Granville to say whether there were any other engagements between France and England; and whether any financial proposals had ever been made to France with respect to the limitation of the debt. Lord Granville, having admitted that there was no formal engagement between the two countries with respect to financial matters, hastened to add that the discussion of such matters between two of the Powers was hardly respectful to the other Great Powers, and had therefore by mutual consent been postponed.

In the other House, Sir S. Northcote also insisted upon the necessity of having some information as to the financial proposals which were to be laid before the Conference, and expressed a strong opinion that the limitation of the period of our occupation of Egypt raised very serious questions. He hinted further that it was not improbable the Opposition might wish to test the feeling of the House as to papers laid on the table. Lord R. Churchill ridiculed the deference paid to France, and urged that the concessions she had made were of the most trifling character, for M. Ferry that afternoon had admitted the Dual Control to be dead, and after the experience of Tunis, Madagascar, and Tonquin, he placed no value whatever on the assurance that she would not send troops to Egypt. He objected strongly to the concessions our Government had made as to the occupation, the neutralisation, and the financial control; and if the House of Commons allowed the Government to go on into Conference without receiving further information as to the financial proposals they were about to make, it would be failing in its duty to the country. Mr. Goschen thought that it would be premature and embarrassing for the House to attempt to pronounce an opinion on this agreement before they knew what course the Powers might take about it. Mr. Bourke replied that, as the Government had laid the agreement

before Parliament, it was impossible to avoid expressing an opinion on it. Mr. Forster agreed with Mr. Goschen in deprecating a premature vote, and Lord J. Manners maintained that though the course taken by the Government in revealing only half their plan was highly inconvenient, it left the House no option but to express an opinion.

It was not, however, until the full text of M. Ferry's speech to the French Chamber came to be known that the full extent of the difference between the two Governments appeared. According to M. Ferry, the English Cabinet engaged to withdraw all its troops from Egypt early in 1888; and he ridiculed the idea that this engagement was potential, or liable to revision on the veto of a single Power. The Great Powers would have to be consulted in 1888, and they would then have to decide whether there was any reason to warrant an extension of the delay now accorded. Europe, and not England, would be the judge, and the engagement made by that country was free from all ambiguity. Mr. Gladstone's interpretation of the arrangement showed that misunderstandings had, however, already arisen, when, in replying to the strictures passed upon the action of the Government, he said: "What we have offered is that we should retain sole discretion in our power until the 1st of January, 1888, and that, at that time, we should come under this engagement and no other—that we should agree not to remain in military occupation of Egypt beyond that term in case the Powers of Europe should declare that the state of the country was then such as to allow of our departure without peril to its peace and order. The phrase, 'reference to the Powers of Europe,' is one perfectly known to diplomatic practice and history. European questions have been decided under shelter of that phrase for half a century and more; and nothing could be more invidious than to presume a division of the Powers into separate lobbies or separate parties in such matters. We think it our duty to take the phrase which is known to diplomacy, and we are perfectly confident in its operations. That, I think, is as much of a reply as it is possible for me to give, except that I may go one point further. I heard some persons say, 'Would the dissent of England be of itself sufficient to neutralize the voice of the Powers?' I must say that I think that if we thought of entering into negotiations so solemn and so important with France, and of undertaking to submit ourselves on certain conditions at certain times to the voice of Europe, having in our own minds the intention all the while to neutralize the action of the Powers of Europe by our own resistance when that time arrives, then I do think there would have been occasion to talk about the honour of this country. I cannot answer for the Government of that day when it arrives, but if the present Government are in office, I have no hesitation in saying that they certainly would not plead the adverse opinion of England in the circumstances of the arrangement into which they have entered with France."

On the question of the Multiple Control, the interpretations of Lord Granville's despatch were equally opposed. In Mr. Gladstone's epitome of the duties of the Commission of the Caisse there remained very few traces of the old Multiple Control. M. Ferry, on the other hand, declared that it would exercise nearly all the power of the old Control, excepting the right of attending cabinet councils. Finally, M. Ferry asserted that England had adopted for its future policy the neutralization of Egypt and the consequent freedom of the Suez Canal. Mr. Gladstone declared that the promise of the Government was only to prepare a plan with this object during the term of the English occupation, and to present it before that term expired. A day or two later Mr. Gladstone, on being questioned, repudiated altogether M. Ferry's view of the evacuation as reported in the newspapers; but as he did not explain how far M. Ferry had been misrepresented, or to what extent the misunderstanding had led to further diplomatic correspondence, the evidence of a common ground of understanding between the two Cabinets was not convincing.

The Ministry, however, had succeeded for the time in postponing any discussion on the questions to be submitted to the Conference; and in spite of the very vague belief as to any practical results from its deliberation, the delegates of the Great Powers met (June 28), and formally elected Earl Granville president. Each of the Great Powers was represented by its Minister resident, assisted by some specially delegated expert to advise upon financial matters—the Chancellor of the Exchequer attending for England, and M. de Blignières for France. Before, however, the Conference held its first meeting, the Opposition in both Houses, by Lord Carnarvon and Mr. Bruce respectively, gave notice of another Vote of Censure (June 25) in these terms:—"That the terms of the agreement between Her Majesty's Government and France, as indicated in the correspondence recently presented to Parliament, are not such as in the opinion of this House would lead to the establishment of tranquillity and good government in Egypt, or justify the assumption by this country of any responsibility by way of loan or guarantee in the settlement of Egyptian finance." This decision on the part of the Opposition, supported as it was by an enthusiastic meeting of the Conservative party held at the Carlton (June 26), was very differently judged in the press. The *Standard* congratulated the leaders of the Opposition on having escaped from the perplexities in which the tactics of the Prime Minister were well calculated to involve them, by declaring frankly and at once that they would ask Parliament to reject absolutely the terms of agreement with the French Cabinet. The apparent aim of the Government by its concessions was the reversal of the course they had pursued in Egypt during the last two years—the recantation of the policy that had been represented by the presence in Egypt of a large military force, and, in a word, the deliberate surrender by this country of any preferential rights,

duties, or authority in Egypt. All they were doing was to provide themselves with an excuse for leaving Egypt, with the certainty either of having to return there, or of allowing our gravest and most precious interests to go to ruin." The *Daily News* was not less jubilant, but for other reasons:—"The leaders of the Conservative party have suddenly made up their minds to fight. We congratulate them on their valour, whatever we may think of their discretion. The action to which they have allowed themselves to be forced is certainly not a subject for regret among Liberals. Whether it be not indeed the gravest blunder in tactics committed during the last four years by men whose blunders have been frequent and familiar, is not a question in which we feel much concern. One good thing the motion will do—it will promote the union and encourage the enthusiasm of Mr. Gladstone's supporters. Sober-minded men who are not professional politicians do not believe a word of the nonsense that is talked about the capitulation of England, the degradation of English honour, the abandonment of English interests, and all the rest of the Patriotic Association's stock-in-trade." The *Daily Telegraph* also approved of the motion:—"Both from the point of view of parliamentary traditions and of reasonable procedure, the Opposition are clearly on good and firm ground in what they intend to do; nor do we think that the voting this way or that has been so much considered by their leaders as the duty—the necessity—of getting clearly into the light of day the true meaning of the bargain struck between Lord Granville and M. Ferry. It has to be plainly asked before Parliament and the people of England whether the Granville-Ferry compact is directed to accepted ends, or framed to make a way of escape for Mr. Gladstone out of Egypt. If the Government has plain and honest explanations upon all these points—as we hope—and is not seeking to 'retire' rather more than to 'rescue,' then undoubtedly the present is the best time to hear how they defend their French bargain. From the standpoint of patriotic duty the Opposition appear to us perfectly justified—and, what is more, decidedly sagacious—in their course, because, whatever the issue of the debate impending, the country will at least be enlightened by it." But both the *Morning Post* and the *Times* were alive to the dangers likely to result from any premature discussion of the Government policy. The latter journal especially warned the Conservatives of the false move they were meditating:—"The Opposition," it wrote, "after all have fallen into the trap which was laid for them, by accident or artifice, when the Prime Minister brought before Parliament the Anglo-French agreement divorced from the financial proposals to be submitted to the Conference. The defects and dangers of the Vote of Censure are so glaring that it would be surprising if some attempt were not made to avert them by moving an amendment which would prevent the House from being committed to approval of the ministerial policy, and would reserve intact its freedom of

action. It is to be hoped, however, that the Opposition may even now consent to postpone their hasty action. If they persist, the debate on Mr. Bruce's Vote of Censure will go on concurrently with the deliberations of the Conference. A more unsatisfactory situation could scarcely be conceived, or one more likely to result in mischief. Parliament ought to be careful not to throw away, by a premature and unguarded vote on Mr. Bruce's motion, the power of passing judgment upon the whole scheme, if it should survive the vivisection of the assembled diplomatists.

When the day fixed for the debate (June 30) on the third Vote of Censure arrived, Mr. Gladstone, in accordance with his promise, moved the postponement of the orders of the day in order that Mr. Bruce's motion should be taken. After an ineffectual effort on the part of Mr. Forster to allow the previous question to be moved, Mr. Goschen, without (as he subsequently wrote to Lord Granville) any consultation with the Government, rose to oppose a direct negative to the Prime Minister's motion. The Premier, he admitted, was bound by his promises and precedent; but the House had a right to disregard these considerations and to look at the general interest of the country, and to remember that Europe would accept the division, rightly or wrongly, as final. Mr. Goschen, moreover, pointed out that the French Chamber had declined to commit itself and to hamper the Ministry by a premature discussion; and that to debate the French agreement when the Conference was still sitting could not but weaken the position of our representatives, whilst by awaiting the result of its deliberations Parliament in no way gave up its control. Sir S. Northcote protested that, the agreement being perfect in itself, and independent of the ultimate decisions of the Conference, a State paper relating to it having been made public, the House was in a position to debate; but the Chancellor of the Exchequer declared that in spite of its promises the Government held that the debate, if proceeded with, could not fail to be most mischievous. A division was thereupon taken, the ministerial Whips "telling" for the motion, for which Mr. Gladstone and the members of the Administration voted, together with the bulk of the Opposition. The rank and file of the Liberal party, however, reinforced by the Parnellites, followed Mr. Goschen, and the motion was rejected by 190 to 148. In the House of Lords on the following day the Vote of Censure, moved by Lord Carnarvon, was likewise postponed out of deference to Lord Granville's strongly expressed opinion that a debate on Egyptian affairs would at that time be highly injurious to the public service. The discussion thus postponed was not again reopened. Throughout the month (July) the Conference assembled at intervals—suspending its sittings at one time in order to have before them the matured views of the financial experts on the position of the Egyptian Treasury. The report of the English Commission on the financial condition of the counties which served as the basis of the views conveyed by the

representatives of England at the Conference, showed the following state of affairs :—

<i>Receipts.</i>	
Revenue	£E.9,224,000
Deduct for short collection of taxes	369,000
	<hr/>
	8,855,000
Deficit	376,000
	<hr/>
	£E.9,231,000
<i>Expenditure.</i>	
Administration, including Tribute	£E.4,667,000
Debt (exclusive of new loan)	3,920,000
Interest and sinking fund on new loan of 8,000,000 <i>l.</i>	351,000
Army of occupation	293,000
	<hr/>
	£E.9,231,000

According to these calculations, the normal expenditure would exceed the normal revenue by 376,000*l.*E., whilst the expenditure of the country was every year increasing. European public opinion demanded reforms no doubt beneficial in themselves, but certainly expensive. If taxation was to be permanently diminished, and financial equilibrium at the same time to be maintained, any increase of expenditure, even on the most necessary objects, must be decisively negated. The report concluded as follows :—

“ Our task is now completed. It only remains for Her Majesty’s Government, in consultation with the other Powers interested in the subject, to decide on the measures which are to be taken in order to restore financial equilibrium. There are, however, a few points to which, before we conclude, we wish to draw attention. The first is, that it must be especially borne in mind, in considering our figures, that we have made no distinction between assigned and non-assigned revenues. We have assumed that the surplus on the assigned revenues will be devoted to administrative expenditure, and not, as heretofore, to the purchase of Unified stock in the market. If this be not assumed, the result would be to increase heavily the normal deficit, and also the floating debt to the end of 1884. Secondly, we wish to state that, in our opinion, no financial settlement will be satisfactory which, upon the estimates which we have framed, does not leave an excess of revenue over expenditure, amounting to about 150,000*l.*E. Thirdly, we are of opinion that measures should be devised to exercise such a check over the Egyptian Government as will for the future effectually restrain them from exceeding the limits assigned to their expenditure. We cannot close this report without warmly acknowledging the valuable assistance we have received, in the course of our discussions, from Blum Pasha.”

The negotiations which took place among the delegates to the Conference revealed from the outset a fundamental divergence of views, and, as the result showed, there was little or no real attempt on the part of France, which took the lead in opposing the English proposal, to arrive at an understanding. Such concessions as were

proposed came in the main from England; although up to the last M. Waddington was ready with new suggestions for making his views acceptable. Seven sittings were held in all. At the first sitting, on the 28th of June, all the plenipotentiaries being present, Lord Granville, who was appointed president, invited the Conference to appoint a Financial Commission, which was done. He then submitted "propositions relative to the finances of Egypt," and the "draft of a Budget." The report on the actual state of the finances of Egypt, by Sir Evelyn Baring, Sir R. E. Welby, Sir Charles Rivers Wilson, and Sir J. M. Carmichael, was ordered to be translated into French to facilitate its examination by the Commission. The "propositions" stated that England would guarantee a loan of eight millions to the Egyptian Government at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., which would have preference over all other loans; that the interest on the other loans, including that in connection with the Suez Canal, at the credit of England, would be reduced one-half per cent.; that the sinking fund would be suspended; that the annual surplus would be divided, one half for the service of the following year, the other half for the liquidation of the various loans, including the new guaranteed loan; and that the contribution for the army of occupation should not exceed 300,000*l.* per annum. The "Budget" stated the cost of administration at 4,667,000*l.*, the charges of the debt at 4,271,000*l.*, the army of occupation at 293,000*l.*, making a total of 9,231,000*l.*, from which 511,000*l.* was to be taken for the proposed reduction on the charges for the debt, leaving a net total of expenditure of 8,720,000*l.* The revenue was stated at 8,855,000*l.*, which left a surplus of 135,000*l.*; but if the reductions of 511,000*l.* were not given effect to, there would be a deficit of 376,000*l.* At the second sitting of the Conference, held on the 22nd of July, Mr. Childers read the report of the deliberations of the Commission since the first meeting. It stated that in the estimate of the normal receipts there had been a great divergence of view between the French and English members of the Commission; that the English estimate appeared to the French delegates too low by about 600,000*l.* per annum, so that, instead of there being a deficit of 376,000*l.*, the French delegates expected that there would be a surplus of 220,000*l.* per annum. The Conference thereupon adjourned for the consideration of this report. At the third meeting, on the 24th of July, the French Plenipotentiary submitted a Note, which proposed as a basis of an agreement a Budget prepared by the French delegates, bringing out the alleged surplus of 600,000*l.*, and maintaining the interest on the debt at its present rate. Mr. Childers, in reply, read the objections of the English Government thereto, and handed in a modification of the original English proposals. At the fourth meeting, on the 24th of July, M. Waddington read a Note, in the course of which he stated that the French Government could not agree to what he called the fundamental question submitted to the Conference—namely, the English proposal for the reduction of the interest on the debt.

After a discussion, in which a general opinion was expressed that no solution could be arrived at until an understanding had been come to between England and France, the Conference adjourned for an hour. On the resumption of the sitting, Mr. Childers explained the character of the English proposals as they now stood, which were to the effect that the indemnities should be paid out of the proposed loan of eight million pounds; that the expenses of the administration should take precedence of the interest of all the debt, any excess to be applied to the sinking fund and to the next year's administration in equal proportions, and any deficit to be met out of the funds provided for the various loans. M. Waddington replied that "it was not possible to accept this proposition in its present form, as the idea of putting the cost of the administration in the first line was a new sacrifice enforced upon the creditors." He accordingly proposed to make the interest on the debt a first charge, and a long and animated discussion followed, in which the extension of the powers of the Caisse was discussed, and the adoption of the arrangement for a limited term of three years was proposed by Lord Granville. The latter question was taken *ad referendum*. At the close Count Münster proposed that the sanitary condition of Egypt should be taken into consideration by the Conference; but this was objected to by Lord Granville, as being foreign to the purpose for which the Plenipotentiaries had assembled. At the fifth meeting of the Conference on the following day (July 29), the Plenipotentiaries stated they had not received the instructions of their Governments, but they discussed at some length the terms of the conflicting schemes. The Conference adjourned after a short sitting. The next sitting, the sixth, was held on the 31st of July. M. Waddington stated that he had not received his instructions. Sir Evelyn Baring said that it was useless to pursue the discussion of points on which it was impossible to arrive at an agreement. The sanitary question was again brought forward by Count Münster, but Lord Granville again objected to its discussion by the Conference. At the seventh and final sitting, which was held 2nd August, M. Waddington presented the modifications suggested by the French Government in the last proposal of Her Majesty's Government. The French scheme consisted of six clauses. The first provided that the loan should be placed on the same footing as the Privileged Debt; the second suggested the withholding of one-half per cent. on the interest of the debt; Article 3 was the same as the English; Article 4 provided for the suspension of the power of liquidation for three years; Article 5 provided that any deficit should be brought to the knowledge of the Commissioners of the Debt, which should determine in concert with the Egyptian Government the measures to be taken to cover it; according to this before a reduction could be consented to a unanimous vote of the Commissioners would be necessary, and if this were not obtained the matter would have to be referred to the Powers. Article 6 provided for an im-

partial inquiry into assessment and the equalisation of the land tax. On this scheme Lord Granville remarked that it differed in two material points from the English Government's last proposition. In the first place, it provided that the new loan should be made in bonds of the Preference Debt, in place of the Pre-preference Debt; and, next, that all the interest of the existing debt should have priority over the necessary charges of administration. If, the payment of the interest of the debt being once effected, there remained a sum insufficient to provide for the costs of administration, the Commissioners of the Caisse would have to decide upon the means of raising it, but they would not have the power to reduce the interest except by a unanimous vote, and in default of this vote the consent of the Powers would be needed, whose agreement was not likely if their Commissioners had not been able to agree. The first modification, providing that the new loan should be issued in preference bonds, would involve a certain increase of interest; but they could perhaps come to an arrangement on that point. The objections to the other propositions were insurmountable. The additional powers proposed by the French Plenipotentiary would, Lord Granville added, give to the Commissioners of the Caisse a preponderance over the Government and over the affairs of Egypt which they could not consent to in any case. He was therefore obliged to declare that they had not been able to find in the Conference a satisfactory basis for the arrangement of Egyptian finance. The incidents of the last sitting were not without a certain dramatic interest, M. Waddington endeavouring to continue the discussion after Lord Granville had risen, and Count Münster protesting against the exclusion of the sanitary question from consideration. On the same afternoon (August 2) Mr. Gladstone announced to the House of Commons the failure of the Conference, giving at the same time an outline of the English proposals; and Lord Granville in like manner related the history of the Conference (August 4) in the House of Lords, bearing especial testimony to the cordial support he had received from Italy, and to the willingness of Turkey to give her sanction to any proposals which did not weaken her suzerainty or compromise the regular payment of the Egyptian tribute. Lord Salisbury congratulated the Government on having got rid of the Conference, which, he believed, was founded on a misconception.

"It was founded," he said, "upon the attribution of a higher international significance to the provisions of the Law of Liquidation than that law justly bore; and Her Majesty's Government, having unnecessarily bound their own hands, had recourse to a very dangerous and clumsy expedient for the purpose of untying them again. There was a great danger—a danger which the event has proved—that if this Conference had come to a decision, those engagements which appear in the Anglo-French agreement with respect to the powers of the Caisse would have developed, as we all feared they would, practically into a Multiple Control. The

very readiness shown by the French Government to utilise and extend and expand those powers proved the importance which they attached to that organisation; and I think Her Majesty's Government took alarm, not quite too late, but very late indeed, when they saw that by giving the power of the purse practically to the Caisse, they were giving to it practically the government of Egypt."

So far, from the tone taken in the various organs of public opinion, Lord Salisbury had very accurately expressed a widespread feeling, and very possibly the feeling of the Ministry also. There was, however, no attempt on the part of the Opposition to take advantage of any credit they might have gained for having predicted the failure of the Conference. A formal and somewhat perfunctory debate was raised by Sir S. Northcote (Aug. 11) on the eve of the prorogation, in the course of which he said that it was a very poor consolation that Her Majesty's Government had regained their freedom with regard to Egyptian affairs, if at the same time they intended to use that freedom as they had used it on a previous occasion. As to the Anglo-French agreement, he wished he were quite sure that it was dead and gone; though it had been said by the Prime Minister that it was in a state of suspended animation, in a state of abeyance; it seemed to be still so far master of their affections that it might yet happen that it might be brought forward and acted upon at any time that appeared to the Government to be convenient. To the Anglo-French agreement the principal objections were three—multiple control, date of evacuation, and neutralisation of Egypt.

In reply, Mr. Gladstone declared Sir S. Northcote's complaint was an underground and unavowed argument for the permanent ascendancy of England in Egypt. For himself, he wished to get out of Egypt as soon as circumstances would allow; but he admitted that institutions, however good, were not likely to survive the withdrawal of our troops. Mr. Gladstone then explained the object of Lord Northbrook's mission, which would be to avert the impending dangers of a national bankruptcy in Egypt, and to suggest the means of rescuing her from her financial embarrassments. The debate dragged on for some time, but finally collapsed without any division being taken, or any pledge obtained from the Government as to the steps they proposed to take, either with regard to General Gordon, to the administration of the country, or to the fears and expectations of the bondholders; and Parliament was dismissed with the somewhat vague assurance that Her Majesty's Government would continue to fulfil with fidelity the duties which grew out of the presence of British troops in the Valley of the Nile.

CHAPTER IV.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

Franchise Bill introduced—Sir John Hay's Amendment—Read a first time—Debate on the Second Reading—Lord John Manners' Amendment—Redistribution—Extension of the Bill to Ireland—Mr. Goschen's explanation—Defeat of the Opposition—Lord Salisbury at Manchester—The Parliamentary delays—Mr. Raikes' instructions—The Disunion of the Conservative Party—Lord R. Churchill and the Council of the National Union—Letter to Lord Salisbury—The Franchise Bill in Committee—Mr. Brodrick's motion to exclude Ireland—The Commencement of the Act—Women's Suffrage—Bill read a third time—Sent up to the Lords—Earl Cairns' Amendment on second reading—Defeat of the Government—Mr. Gladstone's declaration—The "secret negotiations"—Lord Wemyss' Motion for the second reading—Lord Redesdale and the Government—The Government and the Redistribution Bill—Close of the Session.

THE Franchise Bill shared with the Egyptian policy of the Government the honours of the session. The course of its discussion was frequently interrupted, but never seriously impeded, in spite of the dark hints of "veiled obstruction" which now and again found expression outside the walls of Parliament. The Conservatives from the first did not conceal their repugnance to the Bill, not perhaps so much on account of its cardinal principle, the concession of which they knew to be inevitable, but because they were determined, in so far as it was possible for a minority, to prevent a redistribution of seats which might indefinitely postpone the return of their party to power. Moreover, the foreign policy of the Government offered too promising a field for criticism and opposition for any party leader to neglect. That the subject was pressed more frequently than the Government and its supporters in Parliament and the press may have thought desirable or expedient is not improbable, but as the Conservatives were pursuing their own objects, and not those of their opponents, their motives may be regarded as equally praiseworthy and patriotic.

After various delays and impediments, however, Mr. Gladstone (February 29) was enabled to expound the principles upon which the Government Franchise Bill had been framed. He commenced by remarking that the question had been so far advanced by public discussion as to make it unnecessary to enter into any general argument further than to say that the Bill was introduced in fulfilment of a pledge, in obedience to a widely-expressed demand, and for the purpose of adding strength to the State. Moreover, it was unnecessary to argue the case of the classes to be enfranchised, as it had been admitted by the Legislature in the case of boroughs fifteen years ago and was approved by those fifteen years' experience. Touching slightly upon the different conditions under which the present Reform Bill was being introduced, Mr. Gladstone went on to say, amid loud cheers, which were not confined to his own side of

the House, "I am not prepared to discuss admission to the franchise now as it was discussed fifty years ago, when Lord John Russell had to state, with almost bated breath, that he expected to add in the three kingdoms half a million to the constituencies. It is not now a question of nicely-calculated less or more. I take my stand upon the broad principle, that the enfranchisement of capable citizens, be they few or be they many—and if they be many so much the better—is an addition to the strength of the State. The strength of the modern State lies in the representative system. I rejoice to think that in this happy country, and in this happy Constitution, we have other sources of strength in the respect paid to the various orders of the State, in the authority they enjoy, and in the unbroken course which has been allowed to most of our national traditions. But still, in the main, it is the representative system which is the strength of the modern State in general, and of the State in this country in particular."

This assertion Mr. Gladstone illustrated by a reference to the American war, during which exertions, which were antecedently impossible, were made on both sides, because they proceeded from a nation where every capable citizen was enfranchised and consequently had a direct interest in the well-being of the State. The question then arose, Who were capable citizens? This, Mr. Gladstone maintained, had been settled by the experience of the past fifteen years, during which the householders in towns had shown themselves in all senses worthy of the confidence with which they had been treated. The Government scheme proposed to enfranchise the county population on the same footing; for, after all, the main constituents of the county population were the artisans, the miners, and the small tradesmen of the rural towns, and in addition to these the agricultural labourers. That these new voters would prove capable citizens, qualified to make good use of their votes, was already indicated by the elections already made under the first and second Reform Bills in places they classed as towns, but which were, in fact, rural communities based upon a peasant constituency. He defended, moreover, the agricultural labourer against the charge that he was inferior to the skilled artisan, on the ground that very much more was left to him to do—many things which required the exercise of native intelligence; and in this way stood on a different footing to the artisan, whose physical powers were tied down to one mechanical exercise of them. "If he has one defect, it is that he is too ready to work with and under the influence of his superiors," but that, urged Mr. Gladstone, was a defect the opponents of the Bill would be least apt to bring against him, and for this reason: "We are ready, and much more, we are joyful to bring him within the reach of the last and highest privilege of the Constitution."

Mr. Gladstone then turned to the present anomalous condition of the franchise, under which persons whose condition and qualifications were absolutely analogous were able to vote in one place,

and were unable to do so in another, whilst others who were voters in one place lost their privilege by going across a real or imaginary boundary (the river Clyde for instance) in search of or in continuance of their work.

Taking up the history of the borough franchise as already existing in England, he showed how the constituencies had been extended from the enfranchised occupiers of buildings of 10*l.* clear annual value (Act of 1832) to the inhabiting occupiers of rated dwelling houses (Acts of 1867-9).

Proceeding to describe the provisions of the Bill, Mr. Gladstone dealt first with what he called its affirmative side. In boroughs the "ancient rights" franchises would be left untouched; the household franchise of 1867 and the lodger franchise would also be undisturbed; the 10*l.* clear yearly value franchise would be extended to land held without houses or buildings; and there would be created a new franchise, which he called a "service franchise," intended for persons who were inhabitants of a legal house, but neither occupiers nor tenants. This would leave four kinds of borough franchises—the 10*l.* franchise, the lodger franchise, the service franchise, and the household franchise of the Act of 1867. With regard to the county franchise, in the first place he stated that the 50*l.* franchise would be abolished for the sake of simplicity and uniformity; the 12*l.* rateable value franchise of 1867 would be reduced to 10*l.* yearly value; and the service, lodger, and household franchises of the boroughs would be imported into the counties. The changes thus described for England, he said, would be imported, *mutatis mutandis*, into Scotland and Ireland; the borough and county franchises in the three kingdoms would be placed on an identical footing; and in each of the three kingdoms the occupation franchise would be four-fifths of the whole. In Scotland everyone would be left to enjoy all the peculiarities of borough representation there already possessed; here, as in England, the 50*l.* landholding franchise would be absorbed, as unnecessary to both countries; whilst the 14*l.* occupation franchise would be reduced to 10*l.* clear annual value as in force in England. The case of Ireland Mr. Gladstone admitted to be more complex, inasmuch as that country was already in possession of a 4*l.* rating value franchise—given, however, in respect of land alone. This the Government Bill would abolish, and substitute in its place a county franchise of 10*l.* of clear annual value—and extending to Ireland the lodger franchise, the service franchise, and the household franchise as enjoyed by the other two kingdoms.

As to the property franchise in counties, it was not proposed to touch it, and no condition as to the residence would be imposed; but to prevent abuses the Bill would disqualify the incorporeal hereditaments capable of being used for the creation of fictitious votes, excepting tithe rent-charges and hereditaments acquired by descent, marriage settlements, and wills. No one was therefore to be disfranchised—everyone throughout the United Kingdom

who was the head of a household would become a voter. The lodger and service franchises were to be regarded only as enlargements of household suffrage, and wherever the Bill proposed to prevent the creation of franchises hereafter identified in principle with some already existing, it was not proposed to interfere with rights already acquired.

Passing then to the question, "Why do you not present a complete Bill?" Mr. Gladstone argued that no complete Bill had ever been introduced, nor would any minister or Parliament in their senses ever attempt a complete measure. The Government, he said, looked not to the perfect or to the Utopian, but to the attainable, and they would not incur the certainty of foundering by "deck-loading" their measure. Parliamentary reform he divided into three parts—extension of the franchise, registration, and redistribution. The Government would be prepared with a Bill on registration when this Bill had made sufficient progress; but it would be futile to attempt to deal with redistribution. Expatiating on the arguments against this course, he pointed out that the effect of joining redistribution with the franchise hitherto had been that redistribution had always been of a trifling character; that it would arouse local opposition, and, according to the experience of former Bills, would lengthen discussion and lead to complicated embarrassments. He admitted that redistribution ought to follow next session; but to the question, "Tell us, then, your plan," he replied by a refusal to be drawn into a trap. Nevertheless he had no objection to give his own views, without binding any of his colleagues, as to the principles which should govern redistribution; adding, moreover, that he would not take such a step if he believed they were vitally in contrast with any views which prevailed in the Cabinet.

"I do not know," said Mr. Gladstone, "whether it need be as large a measure as that of 1831, which, of course, effected a wholesale slaughter of nominally-existing boroughs and constituencies in this country; but at any rate it must, I think, be nearer to the measure of 1831 than to the measure of 1867. At the same time, I am not at all favourable to the system of electoral districts, or to the adoption of any pure population scale. I cannot pretend to have the fears as to electoral districts and as to their consequences which, I believe, many gentlemen entertain. My objection to them would be one of a purely practical character. In the first place, if you were to adopt electoral districts, they would involve a very great deal of unnecessary displacement and disturbance of conditions which, I think, you ought to respect. But my second objection—and on that I would mainly dwell as being most important—is that I do not believe that public opinion at all requires it, and I doubt whether public opinion would warrant it. Next I should say that in a sound measure of redistribution the distinction of town and country known to our electoral law as borough and shire ought to be

maintained. Although our franchise is nearly identical, yet that is not the question. The question is whether there is not in the pursuits and associations of the place and in its social circumstances a difference between town and country—between borough and shire—which it is expedient, becoming, and useful to maintain. Next, I would say I would respect within moderate limits the individuality of constituencies, and not attempt to place towns which have had representation for many generations precisely and mathematically on the footing of towns that have not. Here is another principle I will call attention to. I am certainly disposed to admit that very large and highly-concentrated populations need not and perhaps ought not to have quite so high a proportional share in the representation of the country as rural and dispersed populations, because the action of political power in these concentrated masses is sharper, quicker, and more vehement. That consideration must apply mainly to the metropolis. Another proposition I will lay down is this—I would not reduce the proportional share of representation accorded by the present law to Ireland. In the case of Ireland, as in the case of some other parts of the country, in my opinion some regard should be had to relative nearness and distance. Take Scotland for example. The nearest part of it is 350 miles off, and parts of it are between 600 and 700 miles off. It is impossible to say that numerical representation meets the case, though I grant that it is pretty well made up for by the shrewdness of the men whom Scotland sends, but that is in virtue of the fortune which caused so excellent a choice. Undoubtedly, however, the representation is exercised under greater difficulties, and it is fair that those parts of the country which, like Scotland and Ireland, are separated by great distances—not omitting the element of the sea—should be liberally considered in regard to the proportion of their members. There is one other proposition, which I am disposed to lay down with considerable hesitation, and not as giving a final opinion. Speaking roughly, what will happen will be this. Smaller boroughs, so many of which are in the South of England, must yield seats for London and other great towns, for the counties, and, thirdly, for Scotland and the North of England, which have perhaps the largest and most salient of all these claims. That operation certainly leads, under the altered circumstances of Parliament, and its increasing business—if Parliament were favourably disposed to receive it, as it has not yet favourably entertained, and I think ought not to entertain it—to a proposition for a limited addition to the number of its members. I ask no assent of the House to that proposition. All I say is, I would not exclude it from view under the whole circumstances of the case, and it may be found materially to ease the operation, which may be one of no slight magnitude and difficulty. Finally, when redistribution comes forward, then come all the propositions with regard to minority representation and to modes of voting. These very important subjects will

have to be fully considered. I myself see no cause to change the opinions I have always entertained with regard to them. I admit that they have claims which ought to receive the full and impartial consideration of Parliament."

In conclusion, advertng to the danger which the Bill would have to surmount and to the amendments proposed, Mr. Gladstone said the object of one of these was to refuse to consider the Bill. It was rather hard that after a hundred Bills had been brought in without opposition, one proposed in a speech from the Throne should for the first time be met with absolute refusal. From direct opposition, however, the Bill was in no danger; but it had much danger to encounter from indirect opposition. Of this, however, he was not afraid, unless it were aggravated by the danger of friendship—for there was a danger of friends destroying the measure by additions which it could not bear:—

"If I may presume to tender advice, it is this—ask yourselves whether the measure is worth having, what does it do, and what does it do in comparison with what has been done before. In 1832 there was passed what was considered a magna charta of British liberties. But that magna charta of British liberties added, according to the estimate of Lord John Russell, half a million, and according to the results considerably less than half a million, to the entire constituency of the three countries. In 1866 the total constituency reached 1,136,000. By the Bills passed between 1867 and 1869 that number was raised to 2,448,000; and now, under the existing law, the constituencies have reached, in round numbers, what I may call 3,000,000. What is to be the increase that we are going to make? The best results I can attain are these. The Bill, if it passes as we present it, will add to the English constituency over 1,300,000. It will add to the Scotch constituency—Scotland being better provided for in this respect than either of the other countries—over 200,000, and to the Irish constituency over 400,000; or in the main, to the present aggregate constituency of the United Kingdom, now taken at 3,000,000, it will add 2,000,000 more, nearly twice as much as was added since 1867, and more than four times as much as was added in 1832. Surely, I say, that is worth doing; that is worth not endangering; that is worth some sacrifice. I hope the House will look at it as the Liberal party in 1831 looked at the Reform Bill of that date, and determine that they will waive criticism of minute detail, waive particular preferences and predilections, and will look at the broad scope and general effect of the measure. Do that upon this occasion. It is a Bill worth having; again I say it is a Bill worth your not endangering. Let us enter into no by-way which would lead us off the path which is marked straight out before us. Let there be no wanderings on the hill-tops of speculation or into the morasses and quagmires of doubt. We are firm in the faith that enfranchisement is good, and that the people may be trusted, and that

the voters under the Constitution are the strength of the Constitution. What we want, in order to carry this Bill, considering, as I fully believe, that the large majority of this country—the very large majority—are in favour of its principle—what we want in order to carry it is union, and union only. What will endanger it is disunion, and disunion only. Let us hold firmly together, and success will crown your efforts. You will, as much as any former Parliament that has conferred great legislative benefits on the nation, have your reward, and read your history in a nation's eyes; for you will have deserved all the benefits you will have conferred. You will have made a strong nation stronger still—stronger in union without, and stronger against its foes (if and when it has any foes) within; stronger in union between class and class, and in rallying all classes and portions of the community in one solid, compact mass round the ancient throne which it has loved so well, and round the Constitution now to be more than ever free and more than ever powerful.”

Mr. Gladstone's speech, which lasted nearly two hours, was listened to with marked attention by a House crowded in every part, and on resuming his seat he was greeted by general cheering, which was renewed again and again.

The hour, however, at which it was concluded was scarcely likely to tempt any member of the front Opposition to reply, and during the dinner hour Sir John Hay proposed an amendment which, whilst it blocked the way for any other, was only incidentally connected with a wider project of reform than Mr. Gladstone had proposed. His desire was to saddle the Franchise Bill with a rider to the effect that, having regard to both population and revenue, the representatives of Scotland should be increased by 15 or 18 members, and that Ireland should forego a proportionate number of her representatives in favour of Great Britain. On this view he found his chief supporter on the opposite side of the House in Mr. G. Anderson, the Radical member for Glasgow, who, however, insisted upon settling the franchise question before entering upon the difficulties of redistribution. At length the views of the Opposition found more definite expression in the mouth of Mr. Gibson, who argued strongly against the proposal to consider the question of Parliamentary reform by instalments, and expressed his belief that the course adopted was due only to disunion in the Cabinet; and he strongly condemned that portion of the Bill which applied to Ireland, where the extension of the franchise, without redistribution, would place at least ninety seats at the command of Mr. Parnell and the Nationalists.

Mr. H. Fowler, for the Radicals, cordially supported an extension of the franchise even without redistribution, and rejoiced that, without regard to the consequences, Ireland was to be treated on a footing of equality with the rest of the United Kingdom. Lord R. Churchill took objection to the Bill chiefly on the ground that it ignored the traditions of the English Constitution, and

was based wholly upon numbers, and that, regardless of consequences, the Government proposed to enfranchise two millions of people who were for the most part grossly ignorant and cared nothing for politics. He twitted Lord Hartington with his former distrust of the Irish electorate, and his objections to an extension of the franchise in Ireland, and declared that until the Coercion Acts were removed it was folly to talk of treating Ireland on a footing of equality. In conclusion, he predicted the ultimate failure of the Bill, for he did not believe in reform being dealt with or exhausted by a discredited ministry.

On the second night of the debate (March 3), after an appeal from Mr. Blennerhassett that some precaution should be taken lest the Irish loyal votes should be swamped by the new Nationalist voters, Mr. Walter gave his experiences as a Boundary Commissioner, which had shown to him how difficult it was to draw the line between representatives of urban and agricultural constituencies. In a large number of boroughs men were already in possession of the franchise, and used it discreetly, whilst those of the same class were refused it in the counties. "It might surprise many members to hear that there were no fewer than five boroughs in England—namely, East Retford, Cricklade, Shoreham, Salisbury, and Wenlock—which contained in all 600,000 acres, ranging from East Retford, with an acreage of 212,000, to Wenlock, with 51,000 acres. Thus the average was 120,000 acres. If it was borne in mind that the county of Rutland contained only 94,000 acres, and the Isle of Wight about the same number, it was seen that in point of area there were already five counties larger than Rutland and the Isle of Wight in each of which occupying householders had enjoyed the franchise for seventeen years. He had never heard of any harm resulting from that enjoyment. Then there were twelve boroughs each with under 50,000 and over 20,000 acres, averaging 25,000 acres each. Each of those boroughs was a large electoral district. The next twenty-two boroughs contained each under 20,000 and over 10,000 acres, averaging 13,000 acres. Then there were eighteen boroughs with less than 10,000 and more than 5,000, averaging 7,000 acres each. Now, an acreage of 2,000 was sufficient for a population of 60,000, and was about the space occupied on the average by a borough of 60,000 inhabitants. It would thus be seen what a large extent of England those agricultural boroughs or counties really covered. Those boroughs, nearly sixty in number, to which he had referred, excluded Sheffield and Leeds, which with a large acreage had also very large populations. But boroughs containing an acreage of over 5,000 occupied no less an area than 1,300,000 acres, or more than the whole diocese of Oxford. With those facts before them, there was not one of his colleagues on the Boundary Commission who did not, like himself, say that when the question of the extension of the franchise to householders in the counties was brought forward, it would be impossible to resist

the claim." Whilst concurring therefore with the Bill as far as it went, he regretted that it was not accompanied by a redistribution scheme, the two subjects being, as he deemed, inseparable. When, however, redistribution came to be discussed, he hoped that the county representation might be increased by merging into them the smaller boroughs; whilst, as to Ireland, he regretted that Mr. Gladstone had come to what seemed a hasty decision, and contended, in support of Sir John Hay, that the proportion of members should be settled as it had been by Mr. Pitt—on the joint basis of population and fiscal contribution, with some allowance for distance and area.

Mr. W. H. Smith limited himself also entirely to discussing the dangers to be apprehended from conferring the franchise upon a mass of people sunk in poverty and ignorance and guided by leaders who were disloyal and anarchical. Mr. Goschen, who followed, argued that the dangers of extending the franchise to an ignorant population were not confined to Ireland, for he still maintained that the agricultural labourers would not be prepared for political duties by previous admission to civil duties through a system of local government. In 1876 he had objected to the admission of the working classes, partly on the ground of the attitude they were likely to adopt towards economical questions. But he now candidly admitted this was not justified by events. When the noxious doctrine of "fair trade" was held out as a bait in the midst of great depression, the working man wanting work stood more bravely to his guns than the politician wanting power. But since the Reform Act of 1867 democracy had been making tremendous strides on both sides of the House. The auspices under which he was first taught his duties as a reformer were well known, and he must apologise if he retained some of the doctrine inculcated by Mr. Gladstone's speeches. Mr. Gladstone had once argued that upon general grounds of political procedure it was not well to make sudden changes in the preponderance of political power:—"While admitting the capacity of a great number of those who are to be enfranchised to exercise the vote, I cannot forget that in giving power to this new class you are taking the power almost entirely away from the other class; and, while I admit that the Government are entitled to say that minorities should not always be able to render nugatory the will of the majorities, I hope that there are members on both sides who still hold that arrangements must be made by which the rights of minorities shall be secured. I do not propose to oppose the extension of the franchise, but I do hope that the Government will convince themselves that arrangements must be made by which those classes from whom power has been taken shall nevertheless be represented at the polling-booth. I agree that the representative system is the strength of the modern State; but the system must be a truly representative system. It must represent all classes, and there may be fear that a liberal enfranchisement of one class

without any precautions may mean the taking away of representation from other classes. I can fancy that these 1,300,000 electors in England and Wales might be enfranchised, and that then, to use the significant words of Mr. Chamberlain, this newly-enfranchised class might be found useful auxiliaries to determine the value of a man's vote afterwards. It appears to me that before those auxiliaries are given to my right hon. friend all these questions ought to be considered. In England it is said that the minority in one place represents the majority in another, and *vice versa*. Can that same argument be applied to Ireland?"

Mr. Goschen proceeded to characterise as astounding Mr. Gladstone's suggestion that in the redistribution of seats Ireland should be secured a number of seats to which she was not entitled. Suppose the Prime Minister found himself unable to carry out his personal view, he must either resign or dissolve; and was the Liberal party prepared to go to the country on the cry that English boroughs were to be disfranchised to keep undiminished the phalanx of Irish members? Mr. Goschen desired to know what the other members of the Cabinet thought on this and on the other question of redistribution. With regard to redistribution generally he argued that that question now was of more importance than the mere disfranchisement of a few boroughs:—"I do not, as a humble member, call upon the Government to tie the two Bills together, which my right hon. friend says would be grotesque. I do not wish to destroy the Franchise Bill. But I do wish, in the course of these debates, to know what is the mind of the Cabinet—what is the tendency of the Cabinet with regard to such vital questions as to how minorities are in future to be heard, how they propose to prevent the total disfranchisement of the loyal classes in Ireland. I should wish to hear from Lord Hartington to what extent he endorses the views which have been put forward with regard to the sacrifice of English seats for the purpose of keeping up the numbers of Irish representatives. I should like to know the views of the Cabinet on this question. If Mr. Gladstone's speech had been the last word, if there were no other hopes to be given to us that Her Majesty's Government might face these problems, I confess that I should feel it my duty to oppose this Bill at every stage. If, on the other hand, I can see in the declarations to be made in the course of these debates that they intend to grapple with these difficulties, and that if there is a dissolution—a contingency which we cannot put out of sight—before they can carry their Redistribution Bill, they will place before the country a moderate programme in accordance with that which has been sketched out by the Prime Minister, I can conceive that one might support this Bill."

There was naturally much anxiety to know what would be Mr. Parnell's attitude towards the Bill and the Government, which had so ostentatiously protected the vested interests of Ireland in the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Without pretending any particular enthusiasm for Mr. Gladstone's measure, Mr. Parnell

that highly concentrated populations like London should not lose their proper share of representation. He wanted to know whether the Government, in the event of giving a large number of members to large towns, proposed to adopt the proportional principle on the system of the *scrutin de liste* as in France, or on the Belgian principle of simple majorities, or by dividing the country into districts. Mr. Forster's own preference was for proportional representation or some representation of minorities in all constituencies represented by more than two members. After a few words from Mr. Gladstone, Sir John Hay withdrew his amendment, and leave was given to bring in the Franchise Bill, which was at once read a first time.

Although the reception of the Bill by the public press followed almost entirely party lines, there was a general agreement, even amongst those organs most usually hostile, as to the moderation of the Ministerial proposals. The *Times* admitted the Franchise Bill to be "simple in its structure, comprehensive in its effects, and conservative in its spirit"—a judgment repeated in almost the same words by the *Daily Telegraph*; but the *Times* protested against the separation of redistribution from the franchise question; and in this it was followed by the *Economist*, which declared that Parliament had a right to demand from the Cabinet a definite assurance: first, that the principle of redistribution once adopted should be applied impartially as between the three kingdoms and as between the different parts of each, and secondly, that the absurdity of a dissolution upon the basis of the new register, but with the existing boundaries, should be avoided. The *Daily News* declared the Bill to be a bold and comprehensive scheme, but very far from being revolutionary. "It introduces no new principles, but simply enlarges the scope within which principles already established operate." It claimed, therefore, the hearty and unanimous support of the whole Liberal party. The *Spectator*, in the same spirit, hoped that all crotcheteers would lay aside their particular preference and cordially unite to pass the Bill as offered by the Government. The *Spectator*, however, declined to express its admiration of the scheme of redistribution as foreshadowed by Mr. Gladstone. Its desire was for the equalisation of constituencies and for increasing their number, as the only fair and intelligible way of recognising the rights of minorities. The *Standard* based its principal objections on the power it would throw into Mr. Parnell's hands, and regretted that in any rearrangement of Irish seats, it should be possible to exclude the loyalists permanently from any influence in Parliament.

Lord Salisbury took an early opportunity of explaining his views as joint-leader of the Conservative party, and they differed only from those expressed by Sir S. Northcote in being more outspoken and definite. At a meeting of the Chelsea Conservative Association at Lillie Bridge (March 12) Lord Salisbury, in reply to a voice which said "Give us your programme," stated that it

was a very simple one. It could be summed up in four words—namely, “Appeal to the people.” “Whatever our opinions may be about the Franchise Bill, I do not think that anybody who consults his memory as to the past—four years ago—will think that the last election turned in any degree whatever upon this Franchise Bill which is now submitted to the country. And if it is true, as a Cabinet Minister has assured us, that the result of this Bill will be a larger change in the Constitution of this country than has taken place since the Revolution of 1688, it is surely a very good reason why the people, who are the masters, and who are chiefly interested, should be consulted before the last stage. Next year is the year in which the whole Irish question must be reopened, because the Crimes Act expires, and it needs no force of prophecy to say that nothing else but Irish legislation is likely to take place in the year 1885. But if that is the case, and if you pass the Franchise Bill without redistribution this year, the inevitable result will be that redistribution will be left over to a new Parliament, elected upon a new franchise acting within the old and unreformed constituencies. Now, a new Parliament, elected by entirely new electors, does not settle down quickly to its work, and consists of men not familiar with public business. Therefore this great question of redistribution, upon which all just and equitable balance of political power depends in this country, will be left to a Parliament entirely new to political work and entirely at the mercy of the Minister of the day.”

From the tone of this speech, as well as from other signs, the Liberal press was convinced that Lord Salisbury's intention was to force a dissolution as soon as possible, and not a few of its leading organs called for a strongly marked demonstration of opinion throughout the country, in order to deter the Conservative peers from supporting Lord Salisbury's scheme. Another peer, Lord Sherbrooke, who, as the Right Hon. Robert Lowe, had been at different times a colleague of Mr. Gladstone, and an opponent of all Reform Bills, wrote to a correspondent that it was impossible to reply to Mr. Gladstone's Bill, since its proposer had not condescended to give a single reason for his measure, but had limited himself to stating its details. From these and many subsequent public speeches, it soon became clear that whatever the course of the Franchise Bill might be in the House of Commons, there was no widespread disposition on the part of the Peers to accept without demur a measure which, though primarily not relating to their House and order, could not fail, if carried, to modify in a very marked degree their political influence and their privileges as territorial landowners.

The second reading of the Bill was moved (March 24) in a few brief words by Lord Hartington, the acting leader of the House of Commons during Mr. Gladstone's enforced absence in consequence of a complete loss of voice. Lord John Manners, on behalf of the Opposition, at once interposed with his amendment that

the House would not proceed with the Bill until it had before it the full details of the Government scheme of Parliamentary reform. After dwelling upon the precedent of Lord Derby, who, as Lord Stanley, in 1866 had done so much to discredit Lord Russell's Reform Bill by a similar amendment, and upon the anomalies of our representative system which the new Bill would augment and aggravate, Lord J. Manners dwelt at length on Mr. Gladstone's foreshadowed scheme of representation, which he regarded as more complicated and far-reaching than any which had ever been submitted to Parliament. The effect, as he showed by the statistics, would be to make many county constituencies unmanageable, and the anomalies which the Bill would create far surpassed any that already existed. Mr. Gladstone's remarks on the proportional representation of the three kingdoms, and his foreshadowing that the South of England was to sacrifice seats in order that Ireland might retain her present number, made it more incumbent than ever that the House should see the whole scheme. According to the present figures, Scotland had one member for every 64,000 of the population, England had one for every 54,000, Ireland one for every 51,000, and Wales one for every 45,000. The exact proportion of members, therefore, would be 496 members for England and Wales, 71 for Scotland, and 91 for Ireland; and if any part of the United Kingdom should lose, it ought to be Wales. But the reason why the south of England was to be disfranchised, and Wales over-represented, was that the one was Conservative and the other Liberal. In the same way, within the bounds of Ireland, Leinster ought to part with members and Ulster receive them. As to minority representation, though with the present franchise he had no desire to see it extended, if a gigantic addition was to be made to the constituencies, those who were interested in the subject ought to insist that the Government should state its views clearly upon it.

"I am not here," continued Lord J. Manners, "to say that the present system is absolutely perfect, but I can say that under the present franchise system labour is amply and fairly represented, and that the peasantry are also represented, to a limited extent possibly, but to that limited extent they are completely represented. If it is thought necessary and wise to increase that representation, nothing could be more easily or satisfactorily accomplished than by widening and extending the county franchise as it at present exists. The proposal of her Majesty's Government, however, is to subvert the existing system, and to substitute for it a totally different system. We say, before you subvert the whole system and substitute a new one for it, let us see what your new scheme is in its details and in its entirety."

In conclusion, referring to the plea that these matters could be dealt with next year, he asked how could this be assured with a second campaign proceeding in Egypt and Ireland in her present condition? The recent elections showed that there was no en-

thusiasm in favour of the Bill; but if the Government thought there was any such feeling, why did they not appeal to the country?

Mr. Bright followed at once, according to arrangement, but his much-expected speech was for the most part a disappointment to his friends, and the great orator, contrary to his ordinary habit, made constant reference to notes, which marred greatly the effect of his delivery. He began by remarking that there was very little in the speech just delivered about the Bill, but a good deal about something that might come, and of which the noble lord seemed a great deal more assured. The amendment was a repetition of the tactics of 1866, the ultimate result of which was the establishment of household suffrage in boroughs, which at least had this moral, that the Opposition did not want any conversion now, having been converted in 1867. If a dissolution intervened between this Bill and redistribution, it would be the fault of the Opposition. The Bill, he believed, however, had no real opponents. It was drawn with statesmanlike skill and wisdom, and in favour of identity of suffrage he quoted from Mr. Disraeli's speech in 1859. It was only when turning to the portion of the Bill relating to Ireland that Mr. Bright found some of his old fire and fervour in defending the proposal to retain for that country its existing quota of members.

"Ireland," he said, "has a certain claim in respect of number, and the Chief Secretary says that that claim may be fairly met by ninety-six or ninety-seven members. The Reform Bill of 1832 added five members to the representation of Ireland. Two of them vanished, and Ireland has now 103 members. Have hon. gentlemen ever thought of the Act of Union? I say the Act of Union is final with regard to this matter. That Act declares in one of its clauses that the Protestant Church of Ireland is to be united for ever with the Church of England. We know what 'for ever' means in such a document. The Act of Union, though it was something like a treaty, was a treaty made entirely on one side. It was made by Great Britain, the powerful nation, and offered to the Irish nation. I wish the House to answer me this question. An hon. gentleman has spoken of the Irish Church. The more powerful party to a treaty or to an Act has a right to surrender anything which afterwards it believes to be unjust to the weaker party. We surrendered the Irish Church as an establishment because we knew it was a grievance to the Irish people, and that it would be an advantage, not to the Irish people only, but to the Church itself, if, as an establishment, it were removed. What has happened during these three past sad years in Ireland? You never heard a word from any person connected with the agitation—land-leaguers, Fenians, or whatever they may be—and I doubt whether anything has been written in their newspapers attacking the clergy of the Protestant Church in Ireland. Is not that a proof that they have been removed from a position which

they never should have occupied? I believe that the bishops and clergy, and thousands of their more intelligent laity, if they could come upon the floor of this House at this moment, would say that it has been an advantage to Protestantism, to Christianity, and to the tranquillity of the country, that the Irish Established Church has been removed. The Government of England, therefore, were at liberty to do that, because it was a concession to the Irish people. Then, I say, there is nothing on earth will ever persuade me, except I see it done, that this Imperial Parliament, which is representative of the people of Great Britain, will lessen the just, the Act-of-Union-settled representation of Ireland in this House. The population of Ireland, reduced as it is, is, I believe, very nearly the same as it was when the number of a hundred members was originally fixed. Some hon. members say that the population of Ireland is diminishing. It has been diminishing up to the present time. I am not quite sure that that diminution is to go on. I shall be disappointed with the operation of the Land Act if it does not, to some extent, retain men upon their farms and in the country. For myself, I am determined to stand by the Act of Union. Nothing shall persuade me to vote for any smaller number; and if by reason of the separation of Ireland from Great Britain, the difficulties of intercourse, and the less power they have to influence Parliament and opinion in this country, it be thought necessary by the Government to keep the representation as it is, I shall have no difficulty in supporting it."

The Radicals, as represented by Mr. Leatham and Mr. Jesse Collings, supported the general principles of the Bill, especially as regarded the treatment of Ireland; but Mr. Baxter, who could with equal justice claim to speak in the name of the same party, expressed his surprise at Mr. Bright's deductions from the Act of Union, which were such as might have been expected from a "highly fossilized Tory," but not from the great popular tribune; and he refused to endorse the Prime Minister's notion that the greater distance from the centre of government gave claims for additional representation. The last speaker of the evening on the Conservative side was Mr. J. Lowther, who warmly denounced the Bill in all its bearings, contending that it would completely extinguish the voting power of the agricultural classes. If a change were inevitable, he would rather see some scheme by which minorities could obtain a fair share of representation, and which would establish some relation between voting and taxation.

Lord Hartington closed the first night's debate in a long and closely-argued speech. He contended that the necessity for bringing forward a complete Bill was not imperative, as it had been in 1866, because the present measure would not create or leave any inequalities in the franchise. The Government had had to consider how they could best carry out the work of reform. It was, in their opinion, impossible to carry a complete measure in

one session, however desirable it might be. The issue with which they were met did not directly traverse the object of the Bill, but imposed conditions which rendered it impracticable. Still, there was in the demand of the Opposition an element of reason. The House was, he thought, entitled to know, not the details, but the general lines and objects of the measure of redistribution, and these had been placed before it by the Prime Minister. With regard to Ireland, Lord Hartington went on to say: "The statement of the Prime Minister that in his opinion a reduction from the number of Irish representatives would not be desirable, has been attacked, but I do not think it has been taken as it ought to have been—namely, as a whole—but has been discussed as to a part which conveys a very inadequate notion of it as a whole. The Prime Minister said that not only in his opinion the number of Irish members ought not to be reduced, but that the principle of remoteness from the centre of government ought to be taken into consideration with regard to the whole of the three kingdoms; and, further, that the claims of Scotland and some districts in England to additional representation could be most easily met by some moderate increase in the number of members in this House. I am not going to discuss the matter now, but I say that if the last two proposals are not accepted, the whole declaration regarding that question requires further consideration. It appears to me that somewhat undue importance is attached to the possible reduction of the number of Irish members. I can understand that members who desire to bring representation into strict and most accurate conformity with numbers may be very anxious to see this principle carried out as between England, Scotland, and Ireland; but to me, who am not at all anxious to see that principle carried out with logical strictness—I am not at all disposed to insist upon the exact proportion of representation as between the three kingdoms. I do not see how it would be possible to stop there and not apply equal mathematical accuracy to different districts."

With regard to the danger apprehended by some that the Bill, if passed, would increase the numbers of the party opposed to the Constitution, he thought that Parliamentary constituencies might then be more difficult to manipulate than Mr. Parnell found them to be at that time; but he had no doubt that the exclusion of Ireland from the operation of the Bill would strengthen his hands, and would aggravate and perpetuate an actual grievance. "Moreover," added Lord Hartington, "it would give the Irish representatives that which they never yet have had—namely, the support of a large and influential class in the constituencies of England and Scotland. To do this would give us all the odium and none of the advantages of restricted constituencies. The question, therefore, which hon. members have to ask themselves is whether, for the sake of avoiding the risk of the election of a few more members who would act with Mr. Parnell's party, we should

place in his hands the great advantage of having a real grievance and of obtaining the support of a large body of the English and Scotch electors. It has also been urged that if we include Ireland in this measure it will be impossible for us to pass a measure for the redistribution of seats in Ireland which will give a fair representation to the minority in that country. I deny the truth of that assertion altogether, and I know of no reason why any principles of redistribution or of the representation of minorities which apply to England and Scotland should not equally apply to the case of Ireland. Do what you may to protect and to give a voice to the loyal minority in Ireland, it cannot, I am afraid, in existing circumstances, have a large representation in this House. The real representation of the loyal minority in Ireland is to be found, not by any artificial devices or by redistribution in Ireland, but in the 550 members from England and Scotland, the vast majority of whom agree much more closely with the minority in Ireland than they do with the majority of the Irish members. The real protection and the real safety of the minority in Ireland will be found in the English and Scotch representation in this House."

The second night of the debate (March 27) brought out with greater distinctness the disinclination of the Conservative party to display any very strong hostility to the proposed extension of the franchise. That some great change, and in the sense indicated by Mr. Gladstone's Bill, was inevitable they were forced to admit, and consequently, in view of future electors, the Conservative leader showed a greater readiness to discuss the Redistribution Bill which was not before them than to analyse the Franchise Bill which was. Mr. Raikes endeavoured to show that the principle upon which the present measure was based—identity of franchise—was the principle against which Mr. Bright in 1859 had fulminated most strongly; whilst Lord Hartington's 'apology' for the Bill was in truth its greatest condemnation. The Bill was not, as had been urged by some, simply supplementary to that of 1867, whilst the analogy would not hold good that, whereas two Bills of that year enfranchised householders in boroughs, so the present measure would only enfranchise the householders in the counties. In 1832 the Chandos clause and in 1867 the Property Qualification clause were both safeguards of which the Franchise Bill showed no trace. It would hand over all the existing county constituencies to the new electors; and although he hastened to protest his admiration for the agricultural population, Mr. Raikes could not conceal from himself the fact that it was not precisely the class to which, without warning or preparation, he would entrust the management of the affairs of the country. Turning to the Irish branch of the question, he reminded the House that, according to the last census, only 40 per cent. of the population could read and only 20 per cent. lived in tenements of more than two rooms, and he protested warmly against a measure which would multiply in Ireland threefold the elements of disorder and disloyalty. Although

there was at present no demand for it, he admitted that, in a time that might come, those who had profited so much by a reign of outrage in Ireland no doubt would be able to produce a tolerable imitation of it in this country. The Bill was the offspring of a policy of despair, and by means of it the Liberal party hoped to change the venue and avoid the necessity of facing the constituencies which they had beguiled.

Two Conservative members who spoke in the course of the evening—Mr. Ritchie and Mr. J. W. Lowther—showed considerable reluctance to reject the proposals of the Government. The former declared that he had long come to the conclusion that it would be impossible to retain much longer the artificial distinction between town and county voters. The latter, representing a thoroughly agricultural constituency (Rutlandshire), admitted the measure to be a moderate one, and supported the proposal to include Ireland in its scope.

Mr. Chamberlain was almost the only member to comment on the unreality of the objections raised by the Opposition, and called upon them to express their views on the merits and demerits of the Bill. The Government thought the extension of the suffrage a good thing in itself, and he asked the Conservatives if they were prepared to put trust in the people, or if they still feared them. As to the intentions of the Government with regard to redistribution he was very reticent, but he signified that it would not follow the precedent set by the Conservatives in 1867, who indiscriminately increased the electors of populous boroughs without increasing their political power. The two grievances which the Bill primarily aimed at redressing were—the giving the right of citizenship to householders and heads of families who perform every political obligation, and next, the guarantee that a vote once obtained would have the same power and value in all parts of the country. Referring to Lord Randolph Churchill's observation that there had been no vast meetings in the country, no tearing down the railings of Hyde Park, &c., Mr. Chamberlain protested that it was a fatal lesson to teach any class that the only way by which redress of grievances could be obtained was by violence. There had, however, been ample signs of the opinion of the country, and of the interest taken in the subject. As to the time not being opportune, he should like to know what time would be considered opportune by the Conservative party.

"We are told that this Bill," pursued Mr. Chamberlain, "if passed, will annihilate the agricultural interest. That is a most extraordinary statement. When you proposed to enfranchise all the artisans in the towns I am not aware that the manufacturers said that their interests would be annihilated. They thought, and thought rightly, that the interests of themselves and their workpeople were identical, and they rejoiced that their workpeople were to be permitted to exercise constitutional rights. Why, then, is the agricultural interest in a different position? Is it pretended that

the interests of the landlords and the tenant-farmers are interests which are hostile to those of the agricultural labourers? That is a very dangerous argument. The interests of the agricultural labourers have been too long neglected and ignored, very much to the injury of the class concerned. What has happened in consequence of the agricultural labourers not having a voice in this House? They have been robbed of their land. They have been robbed of their rights in the commons. They have been robbed of their open spaces. I do not say intentionally, with any desire on the part of this House or of those who were answerable for those proceedings to injure them, but in ignorance of their interests and rights, for which, unfortunately, they had no spokesman in this House. It may be said that these proceedings, which I have not characterised in language a whit too strong, have now come to an end. They are going on still. The agricultural labourers are still being robbed. You cannot go into a single country lane in which you will not find that the landowners on each side of the road have already enclosed lands which for centuries have belonged to the people, or that they are on the point of enclosing them. There is no protection against the steady absorption continually going on of open spaces which belong to the people, but which are being included in the estates of the landowners. That is not all. It is not merely with reference to the land that this injurious operation is going on. It is going on also with respect to the endowments of the poor. Funds which for centuries had been employed for the benefit of the poor have, no doubt, in many cases been abused, and it would be right that the employment of those funds should be altered and amended. But it is not right that that should be going on which has been going on with the sanction of the majority of this House. Under the direction of the Charity Commissioners there has been going on a transfer of property which in many cases transfers from the poor to the rich the funds intended for the poor. Right hon. gentlemen opposite are very eager and not very courteous in interrupting me. In what I am saying now I am not bringing any charge against their party in regard either to the robbery of the land or the robbery of the funds. I take shame to the Liberal party quite as much as to the Conservative party. We are both to blame, but these wrongs would never have been committed had the agricultural labourers had a voice in this House."

On the question of Ireland Mr. Chamberlain differed from Lord J. Manners' view that under the new franchise Mr. Parnell would become powerful; but whether that were the result or not, the Ministry had made up its mind not to perpetuate inequalities which had been useful to Irish agitators. They therefore took their stand upon the Bill, "the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill." He deprecated the use of the "mud-cabin argument" which had been put forward by some speakers, but, deplorable as was the state of things which resulted in such misery, he asked if

it would be remedied by refusing to the inhabitants of mud cabins an articulate voice in the government of the country. In England the lodger franchise, granted by the Conservatives, had placed the vote within the reach of people quite as degraded as the Irish cottier, and no great mischief had arisen. In conclusion, he pointed out that the demand for the reduction of the Irish members in proportion to population rested on the same ground with the demand for electoral districts, for which he cared but little, but the principle of admitting the Irish vote into large towns of Great Britain and refusing it to the same people when living in their own country was repugnant to his ideas of justice and common sense. He hoped, therefore, that the House of Commons would be true to its pledge and its traditions, and pass the Bill by a large majority; then, if the House of Lords was true also to its traditions, the nation would decide between the two, whilst he (Mr. Chamberlain) would have no fear of the result. Lord George Hamilton retorted that the odium of depriving the poor of their charitable endowments had devolved upon the Liberals, and that, as for Mr. Chamberlain's roseate hopes of the future of Ireland, the Bill proposed to extinguish altogether the expression of loyalist opinion.

The interest in the third night's debate (March 31) was almost wholly centred in Mr. Forster's reasons for supporting the extension of the measure to Ireland. He held strongly to the idea that it was impossible to struggle for the Union if we did not treat Ireland on a footing of perfect justice and equality, and preferring that the Separatists should be met in debates in Parliament rather than by force and violence outside. He was not daunted by the threat that Mr. Parnell would become the arbiter of the destinies of the country, for statesmen were too patriotic to postpone the public interests to the behests of a small minority, and public opinion would soon punish any tendency in that direction. But the case of Ireland lent additional importance to the subject of the representation of minorities, and the Government, he thought, ought to consider in what way the minority could be secured in something approaching their fair share of representation. He could not admit either the doctrine that the numbers of the House should be increased or that the number of Irish members should not be diminished; nor could he subscribe to Mr. Bright's views as to the sanctity of the Act of Union, nor to Mr. Gladstone's theory about the distance from the centre of Government constituting a claim to increased representation. According to all the tests, whether of property, electors, or population, Ireland ought to have a diminished number of members. According to what would probably be the population next year, and if Ireland were treated with perfect equality, she would be entitled to 91 members, Scotland to 71, and England and Wales to 496.

Sir M. Hicks-Beach hinted that the including of so many new voters tended to extinguish the representation of those who already were in possession of the franchise, and favoured rather a scheme

by which agricultural voters should acquire votes in largely extended boroughs, leaving the character of the county representation intact; and he was strongly opposed to the extension of the Act to Ireland until the Peace Preservation Act could be safely repealed.

Mr. Albert Gray, abandoning the position he had assumed in his speech at Hexham before the session, urged the claims of proportional representation. Mr. C. Russell was the only Irish Liberal who intervened in the discussion, and he threw the whole weight of his advocacy in support of the Bill. He insisted that the mode of procedure, separating the franchise from redistribution, was in accordance with precedent and convenience, and that it would be inexpedient and unstatesmanlike to break the pledge so often given to Ireland that the franchise should be placed on the same footing in both countries. The present system, as he showed, produced the most glaring anomalies in the Irish representation, both town and country, as compared with England; and, in reply to the "mud hovel" objection, he pointed out that in the districts where the percentage of these dwellings was highest the standard of education and morality was by no means the lowest. As to the diminution of Irish representatives, he maintained that Ireland was entitled to within a fraction of her present number, and her condition was so exceptional that she should be treated not merely with justice, but with generosity in this matter.

On a subsequent night (April 3) Mr. Plunket discussed the Irish part of the scheme from a Conservative point of view, and warned the House that the Bill was fraught with grave danger to the State, and in Ireland at least it would hand over the whole representation to an ignorant, excitable, and prejudiced class. It would aggravate all existing anomalies, and if the franchise were extended without redistribution the House would deprive itself of all power to protect the loyal minority. Without the Bill the Conservatives and the Whigs between them would return 35 or 40 members in favour of maintaining the connection between the two countries. But if the Bill were passed without redistribution, it would be impossible in another Parliament to redress the inequalities in the representation, and the House would be permanently saddled with 90 members banded together for the purpose of breaking up the Union and determined to stop all business to carry their object.

Although speeches continued to be made from various parts of the House on the general question of reform, little or nothing new was added with reference to the actual Bill which stood for second reading. A hope had been expressed by Lord Hartington on the third night of the debate, that the discussion might be brought to a close on the next occasion of its renewal; but in this he received no encouragement from the Opposition leader. The result was, that the Government nights of the week following were given up to a mere formal debate, from which all living interest had vanished, and pretexts of all sorts were resorted

to, to which reference will be found elsewhere, to infuse into the deliberations of the House a more lively interest than the Franchise Bill could arouse.

On the concluding night of the debate (April 7) Mr. Gladstone rose at an early hour in the evening to reply at length to the various criticisms to which, during the six nights' debate, the Bill had been subjected. With reference to the complaints of the absence of arguments in support of the Government measure, he retorted that, as a great many of the Opposition avoided with much caution any declarations against the principle of the Bill, it would have been an abuse of the House's time to dwell in lengthened detail on arguments for its introduction. Still he had founded himself on one very good argument—that it was good for the State that the largest possible number of capable citizens should be invested with the Parliamentary franchise. If that principle were denied, let it be done in plain terms. But if not, then the whole argument was at an end. For the artisans in the towns and the peasantry in the smaller boroughs, being now possessed of the franchise, the law had declared, and experience had confirmed it, that the classes held to be enfranchised were of indisputable capability. The Parliamentary vote was a great educating power; the man who was a good citizen before he had it would be a better citizen afterwards. Moreover, the representation of classes would be far more equal after the Bill was passed :—

“If the representation of classes can be made more perfect, what does that mean but the improvement of the constitution of this House? Has the constitution of this House been improved or not by the Reform Bills which have already been enacted? Perhaps, then, you will repeal these Acts accordingly? But do not suppose that I am going to institute a personal comparison, to discuss merely the composition of this House and compare man for man those who sit here now and the men who sat here sixty or seventy years ago. But what I am going to affirm with great confidence is this—that when we speak of the improvement of the House of Commons, we do not mean the bringing here of a set of private gentlemen—we do not mean the bringing here even of more highly educated men. What we do mean is, that we bring here an assembly better qualified to comprehend the wants of the country, more disposed to deal with those wants in the whole of their extended circumference. In that point of view I do not think that any gentleman will say ‘No’ when I affirm the House of Commons has been improved and shown capacity for dealing with the legislative exigencies of the nation, such as unquestionably under its former composition it could not have shown.”

In reply to his argument that there was no vehement demand for a change, Mr. Gladstone asserted that, among those who were to be enfranchised, there was a very general desire for the Bill, and those who were already in possession of the franchise sympathised thoroughly with them. Passing next to the objections that

redistribution and enfranchisement were severed, he maintained first of all that to unite them would have precluded the introduction of any other important measures during the session, and he repeated that there never had been a complete Reform Bill introduced. He urged also that the method in which the Government had proceeded was the only mode of doing complete justice to Ireland, and that to have combined the two proposals would have had for its inevitable result the placing of local and small interests in direct antagonism to what was broadly and nationally beneficial. Moreover, a knowledge of the manner in which the new franchises would distribute themselves was almost essential to determining prudently the details of the plan of redistribution. It was only when the Franchise Bill and the Registration Bill had been passed that they would be in a position to deal justly and finally with the subject of redistribution. "In our opinion, it is quite wrong and irrational to say that any hardship or anomaly is aggravated by this Bill. There are grievances—there are admitted grievances. It is a grievance pleaded on behalf of counties that they are not sufficiently represented; and that is perfectly true. They are not sufficiently represented; but they never can be more adequately represented until you have a larger enfranchisement of their population. When you have a larger enfranchisement of their population, the counties will take very good care that the question of redistribution shall not be paltered with. The establishment of a wide franchise to emancipate these men and bring them within the sphere of political power and privilege, is, as is well known opposite, an absolute security for making the question of Redistribution certain, for making it urgent, for making it, in the absence of extraordinary circumstances, not only certain and urgent, but immediate."

It was important, Mr. Gladstone admitted, but not essential, that redistribution and the franchise should be dealt with by one and the same Parliament, and such was the intention of the Government, but they held that to enfranchise the county householders first would be the best way to make redistribution just and final. As to the sketch which he had given of redistribution, he said it had not been intended to conciliate opponents, but he asserted that on the whole the adverse criticisms had been concentrated on his references to Ireland. But his opinion, he reminded the House, on this point had been associated with two other points—the question of relative distance from the centre of government, and an increase in the numbers of the House. No doubt Ireland, having only one-seventh of the population of the United Kingdom, was only entitled to 93 members, but he was not willing to assume that the falling off in the Irish population would be permanent, and the injustice done to Ireland in the redistribution of 1832 did not entitle the rest of the kingdom to press for a strict application of a numerical law.

On the question of the increased representation of London

Mr. Gladstone declined to follow Mr. Forster, although he admitted that the subject had swollen to such enormous proportions as to constitute the *articulus* of a good or bad Reform Bill. To the complaint that the Bill was a party measure, drawn up solely to benefit the Liberal party, he replied that it was a great compliment to the party to assume that the addition of two millions to the constituency must be for its benefit. Every fact connected with the Bill confuted the charge, for the main points in it were the large addition of rural classes, the service franchise, and the retention of the property franchise apart from residence, all of which were Conservative measures. But the first article in the creed of Liberalism was to have faith in the people, and he suggested to the Conservative party that it would have been stronger had it learnt to do the same. The debate, he remarked in conclusion, had been languid because the Opposition knew that the question was practically settled, and that the thing must be done sooner or later; and if they wished to disarm the dangers to themselves which they foresaw in it, he advised them not to offer their indirect and futile opposition to an inevitable measure, but to join with the Government in freely extending this boon to the people.

At a later hour Mr. Goschen rose to explain the reasons which forced him to vote against the Government and in favour of the amendment. He reminded the House that on a former occasion he had reserved his liberty of action until he knew the course the Ministry meant to take, but he failed to discover in the measure proposed that they had to any extent faced the problem vital to and inseparable from the matter of protecting the minorities. If the chances were against the passing of a Redistribution Bill next year, what, he asked, would be the chances for the great principle of the protection of minorities? An election on the new franchise would mainly add to the strength of the urban democracy, which would be opposed to any precautions that would weaken the force of solid majorities. Those, therefore, who deemed these securities indispensable in the extension of the franchise did not desire to leave the decision to the new Parliament.

"But hon. members will perhaps say that I am wrong, not only in saying that we have no securities in this measure, but also in saying that securities are necessary at all. They will say that I have made admissions with regard to the qualifications of the working classes to enjoy the franchise, and that therefore they cannot understand why I should take the line which I feel myself compelled to take. But I think that in the great complexity of political forces it is possible that one may occasionally hold opinions that require to be modified by events, and I do not think that it is humiliating to admit that one has made a mistake. It would be far more humiliating to act as if one were not converted when one is converted. The Prime Minister said that Parliament had greatly improved, and that there was now more comprehen-

sion of the wants of the people than there ever had been before. Hon. members say, 'Why not, then, go further and enfranchise two millions more?' That is true in one sense; but I would venture to ask the Prime Minister whether there have not been gigantic changes in the last ten or fifteen years. If Parliament has improved in some senses, are there not totally different views on political questions, some of which might be dangerous to the State? In this House do we not take a totally different view on many questions from that which we took ten years ago? Do we not see that democracy at every turn is clutching the arm of the executive power? Do we not see that it is influencing our actions in our Indian Empire and testing our hold on subject races? We see it in the relation of members to their constituents. . . . There are many members who have spoken of it simply from a desire to enfranchise a large additional number, who have spoken of it simply from the point of view of justice and believing that they would strengthen the Constitution by doing so. But there are other members who tell us plainly that they desire to promote this enfranchisement, not simply from the point of view of voters themselves, but in order to strengthen the position in which they find themselves and to promote the objects which they most conscientiously have at heart. We have been told that we have but to await the advent to power of those two millions in addition to those already within the pale of the Constitution to quicken the pace at which we are now going. They wish to heap on further coals to the fire, in order that democratic progress may proceed still faster."

As to securities necessary for the protection of minorities, Mr. Goschen had no specific of his own to offer. He was not much enamoured of three-cornered constituencies; but rather than have no protection for minorities, he would prefer that they should be retained. In like manner he did not desire to see the cumulative vote established throughout the constituencies, but when a departure was made from the old lines he thought this system might be applied. With regard to Ireland, he was firmly resolved no separate principle ought to be applied to that country. When it was said that the largest class to be enfranchised under the Bill were the agricultural labourers, it was true only to a certain extent. For in thirty counties out of ninety-five, the addition to be made to the constituency out of the industrial and urban element would entirely out-vote the agricultural constituents. Thus in thirty constituencies returning sixty members there would be an entire transfer of political power from an agricultural class to an urban:—

"Many hon. friends who sit around me say, 'What is the good of your individual vote or your speech against the Bill?' I believe there is no greater temptation, no more seductive influence to which we in these days ought more to close our ears than to the siren voice which says, 'Swim with the stream; let the boat glide; statecraft is no more than the clever use of the pole to

keep it from the bank.' That is not my view; and I believe that resistance, even if it failed on a particular point, nevertheless is not without its influence. I believe that a campaign is influenced in its results even by a hopeless resistance made on a particular point. It is said that the wish is father to the thought. I can assure the House that in my case no proverb is more untrue. I have endeavoured to persuade myself that I could vote for this Bill, but I have not been able to persuade myself. My party seem to breathe an atmosphere of Utopia, and to feel a confidence I cannot share. But I wish this House to feel assured that, if I cannot join hon. members who will crowd through the lobbies to pass the second reading of this Bill—if I sit silent as the cheers of victory are raised when the numbers are declared—I shall none the less breathe a most fervent and earnest hope that my own misgivings, which compel my dissent, may be put to the rout by the future course of events, and that the democracy to which the large majority of the House is bent on confiding the future destinies of this country may stand out in splendid contrast to the democracy of other countries, and that by its superior fairness and greater moderation it may prove that history does not always repeat itself and that examples do not always teach a lesson. It is with feelings such as these that I am obliged most reluctantly to announce my intention of voting against this Bill."

Sir S. Northcote, who summed up the case on behalf of the Opposition, remarked that, though there might be some doubt as to the principle of the Bill, there could be none as to the Resolution, the object of which was to compel the Government to throw some light on what at present was a mere shadowy speculation. It was impossible to decide on a Bill which was only a portion of a larger scheme, but what that larger scheme was nobody knew. Where so great a change was involved the House, he insisted, had a right to know and see everything in a clear light. Redistribution, as had been admitted, was the most important portion of reform, and the effect of a Reform Bill depended entirely on the distribution of seats. By the present mode of procedure several sessions must pass before the entire scheme could be carried; for, considering that the Liberals had been four years in office, and if this, as they now declared, was their first mandate, they had so far displayed great self-repression and little eagerness. The pretexts given for keeping back the redistribution scheme were an insult to the understanding of the House; and, viewing the uncertainty as to the remainder of the scheme, it was difficult to believe that the Government were in earnest about this Bill.

The Attorney-General (Sir H. James) replied on behalf of the Government, and in so doing, congratulated the House on the progress which the enfranchisement question had made during the course of the debate. In principle it had been accepted on all sides; no objection was, in fact, taken to the details of the Government Bill. When, therefore, the question came to be

settled, it must be on the lines of the measure before them. Replying in succession to Mr. Goschen's fears of democracy, to Sir M. Hicks-Beach's dread of the extinction of the squires, and to Mr. J. Lowther's hopes of a class-feud, Sir H. James expressed his confidence in the future, and exhorted the House to welcome the new voters with a generous hand.

The House then divided, and there appeared for Lord John Manners' amendment 210, against it 340; giving the Government a majority of 130 votes. The only Liberals voting with the minority were Mr. Goschen and Sir John Ennis, whilst the Home Rulers gave a solid vote for the Government Bill. With 34 pairs and the Speaker, there were only 19 votes to be accounted for, and the absence of many of these, such as Mr. John Bright, was due to sudden or severe illness.

The organs of all parties admitted the decisiveness of the vote, and although the *Standard* thought the significance of the division impaired by Mr. Goschen's speech and vote, it admitted that Mr. Gladstone had fairly met the criticism passed upon his Bill. The *Daily News* said the majority was nearly twice that of the most sanguine Ministerial estimate, and thought that it would probably lead Lord Salisbury to reconsider his project of throwing out the Bill in the Lords. The *Times*, whose sympathies with the measure had never been very warm, said that "the result will be hailed by the country with great satisfaction. The Opposition may for once take advice from an opponent. No more moderate and cautious scheme will ever be offered to them, nor will it be easy to devise another offering so good a prospect of such finality as is attainable in political affairs. The Opposition would now do well to abandon a position which is clearly untenable, and to make the best preparation in its power for dealing with redistribution next session by frankly co-operating in the task of clearing off the legislation already announced."

Before separating, the Bill was read a second time without a division, and the House the following day adjourned for the Easter recess.

The pressure of business left room for only a brief holiday, but on both sides members took advantage of their liberty to place before their electors and the public their respective views on the situation. Sir M. Hicks-Beach, speaking at Tetbury on the first day of the holidays (April 9), admitted that the Liberal majority would very likely hang together until some unforeseen event—whether brought about by the failure of their foreign policy, or possibly by the action of the other House—compelled an appeal to the country. He expressed, moreover, his belief that when that appeal was made the Liberal majority would disappear like smoke, and if the next House of Commons did not show a Conservative majority, the party would be so strengthened that it would exercise an important influence on the destinies of the country. He declared his belief, moreover, in an understanding between the Government and the leader of the Irish Nationalist party, and his

unbelief in the possibility to carry out a transaction which would swamp the votes of loyal Irishmen. Lord John Manners, a week later, spoke in an equally optimistic tone at Castle Donington (April 16), and said that the majority for the Franchise Bill need not frighten the House of Lords out of its senses, and that if the House of Commons passed the Bill as presented, without further knowledge of the Government scheme of redistribution, it deserved to be named the mad Parliament. The Home Secretary (Sir W. Harcourt) naturally viewed the situation from a very different standpoint. In addressing his constituents (April 16) he characterised the recent Government majority as a conquest rather than a victory, and maintained that the Tories, unable to meet the Franchise Bill in open fight, had resorted to all sorts of unusual tactics to delay and obstruct the Bill. He accused the Opposition of having no intelligible policy of its own, and asserted that that of the Government, which proposed to enfranchise two millions of people, was backed by the popular voice. He refused to believe, until he knew it, that the House of Lords would, at Lord Salisbury's bidding, throw out the Bill; and, referring to the desire of the Tory peers to have a dissolution, said the Government would dissolve at their own time, not Lord Salisbury's. The Tories were now hoping that something would happen in Egypt which might overthrow the Government.

To this assertion Lord Salisbury replied, without delay, at a banquet given in the Free Trade Hall, Manchester. Expressing his surprise that Sir William Harcourt should find such cause for exultation in the fact that the Franchise Bill had been carried through its second reading by so large a majority, he declared that it only meant that the Government had "squared" the Irish. The bid, he protested, was somewhat barefaced, the bargain was somewhat naked, but, its ends having been achieved, he thought the less they said about it the better. The Franchise Bill was made to fight over, and not to work. He had no objection to the enfranchisement of the suburban populations, but with a view to that a Redistribution and Boundary Bill was first necessary. As to the agricultural labourers, they did not desire to possess the franchise. To the Conservatives it was a matter of life and death that redistribution should be fair, while they had every reason to distrust the Government in the matter. If the latter remained uncontrolled, in presence of their desire to square the Irish party, the nation would not quarrel with the Lords for insisting that the Commons should wait until the will of the people was ascertained. It was, moreover, essential that redistribution should accompany the Franchise Bill, because the first effect of a lowered franchise was always Radical. In a struggle such as was impending organisation was everything, and, as a rule, the Tories never organised in time, and he hoped that they would on this occasion take warning by the fact. As for the Government proposal with regard to Ireland, giving to that country its full quota of one

hundred members, in spite of the fact that the population to be represented had diminished by two millions, it could only be characterised as absurd, and almost as fantastic as that theory which suggested that distance from the seat of Government should give a claim to increased representation. Lord Salisbury, in conclusion, ridiculed the idea that the Lords would become obnoxious to the people for insisting upon an appeal to them, and repeated that it was the Liberals, not the Opposition, who were afraid of a dissolution.

On the reassembling of the House of Commons the Bill was at once taken up (April 28), but Mr. Raikes interposed, before the Speaker left the chair, with an instruction to the Committee to make provision for a redistribution of seats and for the representation of populous urban districts. He contended that this motion differed altogether from Lord John Manners' amendment, inasmuch as the latter condemned the Bill for the omission of redistribution. His object was to supply the omission, but in his speech he abstained from any argument in support of the proposal contained in his resolution, as originally framed, that the new urban districts should get their members from the disfranchisement of the populous boroughs.

Mr. Gladstone said that the arguments adduced had already been urged in former debates and decision pronounced on them. Accordingly he regarded Mr. Raikes's speech as made merely to consume time, and he advised his friends to take no part in the discussion. "I myself was once," said the Premier, "so bold, and perhaps so rash, as to frame a general definition of what might be called obstructive speaking, and I defined it to be 'speaking which is not addressed to carrying conviction to the minds of the House.' But though it is not addressed to that end, it occupies the time of the House, and is, therefore, naturally construed and taken to be adopted and addressed for the purpose of consuming that time. I frankly own that is the construction which I for one, and others on this side of the House, have placed on the speech of the right hon. gentleman, and I think very possibly some members sitting on the other side may do the same."

Lord Randolph Churchill protested against what he called a mandate to silence discussion. He protested also against the trick of the Liberal "jerrymanderers," who had made up their minds that the most favourable electorate to which they could appeal would be one not distributed, but flooded in the counties, with non-rural voters. By way of protest against the Government's silence, Mr. Brodrick moved the adjournment of the debate, and was supported by Sir Stafford Northcote. When Lord John Manners accused the Premier of having been at one time concerned in the proceedings of the Tory party in obstructing Reform Bills, Mr. Gladstone repudiated the suggestion with his accustomed vigour. "I was not concerned," he said, "in any of these proceedings. I belonged to that party when it was a very different party indeed—when it was a party under Sir Robert Peel, the Duke of

Wellington, and Lord Aberdeen. I have never been ashamed before Liberal audiences to refer to my connection with that party. I have always said, though I may have given votes at that period which I may regret, that that party in its high and honourable conduct, in its contempt for unparliamentary proceedings, in its incapability of condescending to unworthy ends, was as pure and high-minded a party as ever sat in this House."

The motion for adjournment was negatived by 108 to 71; and after several more speeches, the instruction was also negatived by the small majority of 27—174 to 147. Encouraged by this apparent success of their tactics, the Conservatives decided to persevere in their opposition at this stage; and accordingly Mr. Tomlinson at once moved "That it be an instruction to the Committee to provide for the extension of the boundaries of the Parliamentary boroughs." This was objected to by the Attorney-General as reopening the whole question of redistribution; and, after some debate, was also negatived by almost the same majority—158 to 132. Sir R. Cross then endeavoured to move that the committee have power to make provision for the due registration of all persons entitled to be registered as voters under the Bill. But this motion was held by the Speaker to be out of order, inasmuch as it was already competent for the Committee to deal with the subject of registration. But Conservative obstinacy or obstruction, as it was variously described by the Liberal organs, was not of long duration, and before the subject was resumed (May 1) other counsels had prevailed. The Lord Mayor, who had a motion to go into Committee that day six months, withdrew it, expressing his hope that the House of Lords would ensure an appeal to the country before accepting the Bill from a moribund Parliament. His example was followed by Mr. Chaplin, who denounced the new "Kilmainham Treaty" which was to confer upon Ireland an extended county franchise. He then withdrew his amendment, but not before Mr. Gladstone had interposed with a vigorous and incisive speech, in which he claimed for the Liberal party the credit of having endeavoured for the previous ten years to put the Irish franchise on an equal footing with that of Great Britain. The taunt, therefore, about a new "Kilmainham Treaty" to account for the inclusion of Ireland in this Bill was most uncalled for and unjust. In the belief of the Government, there was but one course which would tend to reconcile the feelings and sympathies of the Irish people with the "Invincibles," and that course would be to deny the advantages of the Union to the Irish people. Narrowing the franchise was not a protection against revolution, as the Government of Louis Philippe in France had proved. He ventured even to rejoice that Ireland would not submit to be treated on a footing of inequality in the Union; and it seemed to him absurd, as well as ungenerous, to grudge the Irish equal representative privileges on the plea that if they used them they would force on a dissolution of the Union. Great Britain was quite strong enough to hold her own

against Ireland, even if Ireland were unanimous; but there was one other item which bore weight in the scale; "Let us be as strong in right as we are in population, in wealth, and in historic traditions, and then we shall not fear to do justice to Ireland."

After this speech the debate gave proof of the fundamentally divergent views of the Opposition. Mr. Newdegate bewailed the condition of the Conservative party, calling Sir Stafford Northcote its ex-organiser. Mr. Yorke once more denounced the "Kilmainham Treaty," and Mr. Salt insisted that what Ireland wanted was "rest." Mr. Finch Hatton expressed his entire willingness to wait for the English franchise till Ireland was ready for it; Mr. Gorst, on the part of the Fourth Party, repudiated Mr. Chaplin; and finally, Lord George Hamilton explained that, though the Tory party were completely united as to the mischief which the Bill would do to Ireland, they were excusably divided as to whether it was right that Great Britain should wait for the franchise till Ireland was ready, or whether Ireland should be subjected to injury rather than that Great Britain should wait. The Irish members, Mr. King-Harman excepted, insisted on the necessity of putting Ireland and England under the same law, and eulogised the determination of the Government. But on none of these points was any further trial of strength made, and almost unexpectedly the debate was brought to an end, and the House was allowed to go into Committee without a division being called.

This sudden collapse of an opposition which might, without being qualified as unfair obstruction, have been protracted for days, gave rise to rumours of all sorts as to the divisions existing in the Conservative camp. A clue to what was going on amongst the chiefs of the party was promptly caught up, the secret not having been so well kept as had been the cause of the supposed or real dissensions among the members of the Liberal party, which had been the subject of common report a few weeks previously. The discussions on the Franchise Bill, however, although left for the most part to the Conservatives, had revealed a fundamental difference of opinion as to the way in which the campaign was to be fought, and as to the ground upon which the Conservatives should take their stand. Sir Stafford Northcote and the majority of the members of the previous administration leaned to the side of accepting, under protest, the inevitable Franchise Bill, saddling its application with such restrictions and conditions as would maintain the existing principles of representation. Lord Randolph Churchill, however, seemed, on the other hand, to be eager to unfurl the standard of a Tory democracy, and, by the aid of single-seat electoral districts, to recruit his party by the representatives of minorities even in the strongholds of dominant Radicalism. With this object in view, he had not hesitated to make common cause with Mr. Labouchere in vindicating the rights of the National party in Egypt, nor had he scrupled to support Mr. Broadhurst's Bill for the enfranchisement of the tenant at the expense of his landlord, introducing, at the

same time, a Bill of his own, which contained even more drastic proposals for the benefit of the leaseholder. Sir S. Northcote, who at this moment was supposed to be looking for a general or partial accession to his side of timid Liberals and wealthy Whigs, found his plans suddenly upset by one on his own side of the House, who showed a readiness to outbid for popular favour all but the most reckless and purblind of his opponents.

This divergence of views was first made the common property of the public by Lord R. Churchill's resignation of the chairmanship of the council of the National Union of Conservative Associations (May 3), on the alleged ground that greater freedom of action was required by provincial associations than the central committee was willing to concede. Lord R. Churchill had been elected by a majority of one vote to the office of Chairman at the close of the previous Session of Parliament, and although his supporters had not been numerous, he had succeeded in obtaining the appointment of an Executive Committee consisting of himself, Mr. Gorst, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, and one or two others. This committee refused to recognise the authority of the central committee (composed of Lord Salisbury, Sir S. Northcote, Mr. E. Stanhope, Mr. A. Balfour, Mr. Salt, Mr. Whitley, and the party Whips), and claimed a greater voice in deciding the line of party tactics as well as in the direction of the party policy. It was said that when Lord R. Churchill first began to show his capacity for attack, and his boldness in pushing to extremes the admissions of his opponents, he received more encouragement from Lord Salisbury than from Sir S. Northcote; and it was repeatedly asserted that the harassing tactics pursued by the member for Woodstock were more in harmony with the wishes than with the instructions of Lord Salisbury. However this may have been, Lord R. Churchill's open adoption of the views of Mr. Broadhurst on the enfranchisement of leaseholds, coupled with an avowed desire to adopt the method of the Birmingham caucus in the Conservative Union, at once produced a schism in the Association and changed the attitude of the official Conservatives, who felt it necessary to insist upon a greater show of discipline throughout the party. At a meeting of the council of the National Union a motion was proposed and carried by four or five votes to the effect that "it is of paramount importance that the central committee of the party and the council of the National Union should act harmoniously together. Although Lord R. Churchill's name, as well as Mr. Gorst's, was included in the proposed committee, the former regarded the motion as a vote of censure, refused to serve on the committee, and resigned his chairmanship of the Union. A somewhat acrimonious correspondence ensued, in the course of which a letter, which had been written a month previously (April 3) to Lord Salisbury by Lord R. Churchill, was published in the *Standard*. This letter ran as follows:—"The delegates at the conference were evidently of opinion that if the principles of the

Conservative party were to obtain popular support the organisation of the party would have to become an imitation, thoroughly real and *bonâ fide* in its nature, of that popular form of representative organisation which had contributed so greatly to the triumph of the Liberal party in 1880, and which was best known to the public by the name of the Birmingham caucus. The caucus may be, perhaps, a name of evil sound and omen in the ears of aristocratic or privileged classes, but it is undeniably the only form of political organisation which can collect, guide, and control for common objects large masses of electors, and there is nothing in this particular form of political combination which is in the least repugnant to the working classes in this country. The council committed the serious error of imagining that your lordship and Sir Stafford Northcote were in earnest in wishing them to become a real source of usefulness to the party. The council have been rudely undeceived. The day after the adoption of the report, before even I had had time to communicate that report officially to your lordship, I received a letter from Mr. Bartley, the paid agent of the leaders, written under their direction, containing a formal notice to the National Union to quit the premises occupied by them in conjunction with the other organising officials, accompanied by a statement that the leaders declined for the future all and any responsibility for the proceedings of the National Union. Further, in your letter of the 1st inst. you express your disapproval of the action of the council, and decline to consider the report on the ground that the contemplated action of the council will trench upon the functions of an amorphous and unknown body, styled the 'central committee,' in whose hands all matters hitherto disposed of by the leaders and whips of the party must remain, including the expenditure of the party funds. In the same letter you state that you will indicate with more precision the objects at which the council of the National Union should aim, the result being that the precise language of your former letter of the 29th February is totally abandoned, and refuge taken in vague, foggy, and utterly intangible suggestions. Finally, in order that the council of the National Union may be completely and for ever reduced to its ancient condition of dependence upon and servility to certain irresponsible persons who find favour in your eyes, you demand that the whips of the party—meaning, we suppose, Lord Skelmersdale, Lord Hawarden, Lord Hopetoun, in the Lords; Mr. Rowland Winn, Mr. Thornhill in the Commons—should sit *ex officio* on the council, with a right of being present at the meetings of all committees. . . . You further inform us that, in the event of the council—a body representing, as it does, upwards of five hundred affiliated Conservative Associations, and composed of men eminent in position and political experience, enjoying the confidence of the party in populous localities, and sacrificing continually much time, convenience, and money to the work of the National Union—acquiescing in the view of its functions laid down in your letter of the 1st April, it may be graciously

permitted to remain the humble inmate of the premises which it at present occupies. We shall lay your letter and copy of this reply before the council at its meeting to-morrow, and shall move the council that they adhere substantially to the report already adopted in obedience to the direction of the conference at Birmingham; that they take steps to provide themselves with their own officers and clerks; and that they continue to prosecute with vigour and independence the task which they have commenced—namely, the *bonâ fide* popular organisation of the Conservative party. It may be that the powerful and secret influences which have hitherto been unsuccessfully at work on the council, with the knowledge and consent of your lordship and Sir Stafford Northcote, may at last be effectual in reducing the National Union to its former make-believe and impotent condition; in that case we shall know what steps to take to clear ourselves of all responsibility for the failure of an attempt to avert the misfortunes and reverses which will, we are certain, under the present effete system of wire-pulling and secret organisation, overtake and attend the Conservative party at a general election.”

Lord R. Churchill at once wrote to disclaim all knowledge of the publication of this letter, declaring the person who had communicated it without the authority of the Council of the National Union to have been guilty of a gross breach of confidence. It was not altogether, however, without its uses: for a few days later the desire for a better understanding on both sides became apparent. The olive branch was first publicly held out by Mr. E. Stanhope, who, at a meeting in Finsbury (May 7), while rejecting all that was repugnant to true independence of thought and action in the Radical caucus, said there was no reason why Conservatives should not also boldly adopt and carry into action everything in it based on sound principles. On the following day the chairmen of the Conservative associations in some of the largest constituencies in England and Scotland held a meeting in London. One of the principal grievances complained of was that the supreme committee of the party, nominated by the leaders and the whips, was not popular in its constitution or representative in its character. The Union demanded the suppression of this body, and proposed that half of the committee should be nominated, as before, by the leaders and the whips, but that the rest should be appointed by the council of the National Association. The gathering afterwards had an interview with Lord Salisbury, Lord Randolph Churchill, and the committee of the National Union. According to the *Daily News*, the result of the negotiations was that Lord Randolph consented to withdraw his resignation of the chairmanship of the Council of Conservative Associations, and it was also arranged that the principle contended for by him should to a considerable extent be adopted in the relations of the central committee with the Conservative associations throughout the country as represented by the council. The general impression

on both sides of the House of Commons was that Lord Randolph had secured a substantial victory. It was due to overtures directly made from the titular leaders that he consented to forego his intention of seeking temporary retirement and to renew his official connection with the organisation of the Conservative party, and at a meeting of the party at the Carlton Club (May 9) he followed the chairman (Sir Stafford Northcote), and cordially seconded his views on the subject of the Vote of Censure and the amendments on the Franchise Bill.

Meanwhile the Bill had been making but slow progress in the House of Commons. Although the House had formally gone into committee (May 1), progress had been at once reported, and it was not until nearly a week later (May 6) that the consideration of its details was taken up. Clause 1 was agreed to without discussion, but Sir R. Cross moved to insert, at the very beginning of Clause 2, words which would pave the way for amendments which might alter even the spirit of the Bill, as confirmed by its second reading. Mr. Gladstone replied at once that the intention of the Bill was to establish uniform household and lodger franchise in counties and boroughs: he could not accept any amendment which suggested that any departure from that principle might be effected by the subsequent clauses of the Bill. In the discussion which followed, Mr. Gorst spoke against the amendment, and when the division was called he and Lord R. Churchill separated themselves from the bulk of the Conservatives, and the amendment was rejected by 263 to 149. Mr. Stanley Leighton's amendment, proposing to give freeholders in boroughs a right to vote for the borough in respect of their freehold, independent of residence, although prolonged over two afternoons, revealed still further the divided counsels of the Conservatives. Sir R. Cross opposed the suggestion on the ground that, if carried, it would disfranchise upwards of 130,000 county voters residing in boroughs. Mr. Gladstone, admitting this property qualification to be part of the ancient voting system of the country, held that the amendment, in removing one anomaly, would introduce a far greater, and would give scope for the wholesale manufacture of faggot votes. After a long discussion it was negatived without a division (May 16), whilst Sir R. Cross's proposal to exclude county lodgers from the provisions of the Bill, on the ground of the facilities it would offer for fraud, was, after a speech by Sir C. Dilke, withdrawn.

The momentous question of the attitude of the Conservatives towards an extended Irish Franchise had now to be faced, and from the outset it was understood that considerable divergence of opinion prevailed. All hope of detaching any English Whigs or Scotch Liberals had been given up at an early period, but it was nevertheless important to give some encouragement to those who were to fight what was known beforehand to be a losing battle. On the very day on which Lord Claud Hamilton's amendment was to be moved (May 16) an article appeared in the *Standard*, announcing

with the tone of authority that, should the Bill reach "the Upper House, a resolution will be proposed which, if carried, will be tantamount to its rejection." The reason assigned was that the Conservative party, although not opposed to an extension of the franchise, objected to the piecemeal and partisan fashion in which the question was being dealt with by the Government. This announcement of the intentions of the Peers to deal with a measure not before them was denounced in many directions as not only unusual but unconstitutional. The explanation given was that the Conservatives, believing their position in the country to be stronger than their position in the House of Commons, were anxious to force a dissolution in the autumn. This, however, the Ministerial organs declared to be most improbable, and that the only result of a rejection of the Franchise Bill would be an autumn session, in which the Bill, unaltered, would be sent up again to the Lords, and they would then be left to face the charge of wilfully obstructing the course of public business. It was therefore not surprising that, under these circumstances, Lord C. Hamilton's amendment to substitute "Great Britain" for "the United Kingdom" should have given rise to warm debating and open speaking.

Mr. Brodrick, who moved it in the absence of its author, referred to a return which showed that out of 760,000 inhabited houses in Ireland, 662,000 were under 4*l.* rateable value, and 435,000 under 1*l.* He urged that the inclusion of Ireland, so far from guaranteeing equality between England and Ireland, would produce inequalities of "so vast and striking a description between the two countries, that it would amount to a gross injustice to the other portions of the United Kingdom. If they succeeded in passing the measure, the Government would concentrate in that House all the evil passions, all the patriotic follies, and all the delusive sentimentalities which were now wasted at public meetings throughout Ireland."

Mr. Trevelyan declared that no power on earth would induce a Liberal Ministry to push forward a Franchise Bill for England and Scotland, excluding Ireland, and that for himself he would not remain five minutes in an administration which took such a course. As for the Crimes' Prevention Act, he reminded the Opposition that all its more important provisions were in force when Mr. Disraeli last extended the franchise to Ireland.

Mr. Plunket, however, on the part of the Conservatives, was not so easily satisfied. He did not contend that the humblest and least educated class of Irish householders should not be represented; but, as the Bill would admit these in such wholesale numbers, the better educated, the more civilised, all those classes in Ireland who were best able to form an opinion on political questions, would be practically disfranchised. It would be, he argued, madness to give increased power to those who wished to break up the unity of the empire.

The repetition of the same line of argument at once aroused

Mr. Gladstone, who replied with energy that it was impossible to go back to the old policy of distrust and injury :—

“For myself I will never consent to divide the people of Ireland into a loyal minority and a disloyal majority; but, if I am to adopt the right hon. gentleman’s phrase, I would say that no laws can be passed in this House under Irish influence adverse to the loyal minority in Ireland, except by the consent of the representatives of England and of Scotland, and whatever may be the right hon. gentleman’s want of faith in the future, whatever be his faculty of drawing these dismal pictures to alarm us in the course on which we are entering, he surely must think that there is some security in the composition of this House for the interests of the loyal minority, as he calls it, in Ireland. Is it the fact that the position of Great Britain at this moment is weaker in the face of Ireland than it was before that period of attempted conciliation began? I say that England fifty years ago stood in the face of the civilised world as a culprit with regard to Ireland; I say that the civilised world has now entirely changed its judgment; whether or not we may have been able on all points to settle a satisfactory system, civilised mankind knows and admits that for a course of years there has been an honest and an energetic attempt to move in this direction; and that conviction on the part of the civilised world is the only element that could be wanting in the strength of this country in regard to its relations with Ireland. There is one way of making England weak in the face of Ireland, and that is to apply to Ireland principles of inequality and injustice. As long as we endeavour to do you justice” (said Mr. Gladstone, turning to the Home Rulers) “you cannot, if you are ever so ill-disposed, touch or mar or prejudice in any respects the interests of this United Kingdom. It is equal justice that will determine the issue of the conflict, if conflict there is to be, and there is nothing we can do, except the imprudence of placing in your hands evidence that we were not acting on principles of justice towards you, that can for one moment render you formidable in our eyes, should the day unfortunately arrive when you should endeavour to lay hands upon this great structure of the British Empire. It is in truth a noble inheritance received from our forefathers that we have endeavoured to purge from some stains that undoubtedly history will record as attaching to it in those generations on which the right hon. gentleman seems to look back as the period of safety and of glory. The right hon. gentleman opposes the extension of the Bill to Ireland because there are a great number of persons who are living in 1^l. houses. Well, who are those persons? The right hon. gentleman declines to recognise their fitness for the franchise. I am not aware that there is any test applied in England, and there is none in Scotland. In Ireland the houses are poorer than the houses of electors in England. Is that a reason why the interests of the people in Ireland should be less represented in the Legislature? On the contrary, is it not a reason why they may want more protection?”

After a few deprecatory words from Sir S. Northcote, the discussion, it was supposed, would have ended, but a desultory discussion sprang up, and was not concluded when by the rules of the House the adjournment took place. On the resumption of the debate (May 20) Lord R. Churchill, whose reconciliation to the party leaders had been so ostentatiously paraded a few days before, once more separated himself from them. In a speech which was received in ominous silence by the bulk of the Conservatives, Lord R. Churchill asked Mr. Brodrick to withdraw his amendment, against which he felt constrained to vote. After weighing the arguments brought forward, he congratulated the Government upon their statesmanship in having included Ireland in their Bill, and he declared that there was far less difference between the mud cabin of the Irish and the cottage of the English agricultural labourer than between his own "humble dwelling" and that of the right hon. member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith). He held, moreover, that the enfranchisement of the Irish agricultural labourer would be favourable to the cause of the landlords as well as to the British connection, and he appealed to his party not to alienate large classes of Her Majesty's subjects by voting in favour of the amendment. In reply Lord Claud Hamilton urged that, if the franchise were extended to Ireland as proposed, the days of Home Rule were not far distant, for with eighty votes in the next Parliament the Home Rulers would hold the fate of parties in their hands and would render legislation impossible unless the Government of the day were prepared to concede their demands. Subsequent discussion showed a still further dissension of opinion in the ranks of the Opposition, and ultimately Mr. Brodrick's amendment was rejected by 332 to 137, a few Conservatives voting with the Government, and a considerably larger number taking no part in the division. Sir H. D. Wolff promptly obtained the assent of the Government to his proposition to postpone to a subsequent period the decision as to the date when the Act should come into operation; but Colonel Stanley's proposal, that the new Franchise Bill should not come into effect until a new Redistribution Bill or a fresh Boundary Bill had been passed, gave rise to very strong expression of party views. It had been the wish of very many, chiefly on his own side of the House, that Colonel Stanley should postpone his amendment until Mr. Albert Grey's proposition to defer the operation of the Franchise Bill until January 1, 1887, had been disposed of. Colonel Stanley, however, declined to accede to this wish, on the ground that, should a dissolution take place between the passage of the two Bills, the county constituencies would be in an anomalous as well as an unmanageable position. He instanced in support of his argument that the constituency of Mid-Cheshire would be raised from 10,000 to 23,000; that of West Cheshire from 13,000 to 27,000, North Lancashire from 18,000 to 42,000, North-East Lancashire from 13,000 to 42,000, South-West Lancashire from 28,000 to 73,000, and South-East Lancashire from 28,000 to 90,000. The vital difference between the two amendments was

that whilst Mr. Albert Grey sought to guard against a chance dissolution, necessitating a general election with the new franchise applied to the old constituencies, Colonel Stanley sought to take precautions against a dissolution brought about with that special aim. He was prepared therefore to postpone indefinitely the application of the new franchise pending the passing of a new redistribution scheme. Mr. Gladstone replied that the terms of the amendment might be complied with by the passing of a small Boundaries Bill, whereas the essence of a Redistribution Bill lay in enfranchisement and disfranchisement. But the intention of the amendment, he said, was very different, and he characterised it as the worst form of raising the question, for it would enable the House of Lords, by the simple device of throwing out the Redistribution Bill, to nullify the whole labour of the House of Commons on the Franchise Bill, and to postpone the whole question of reform indefinitely.

Mr. E. Stanhope said it was the duty of the House to give to the agricultural interest its fair share of representation. While he admitted that the Bill might take away the power of the farmers, he would observe that the farmers did not represent the agricultural interest. If the Bill became law at once, and a dissolution took place before a redistribution scheme were carried, the agricultural element would be swamped by the urban. The real point was that they were going to give the benefit of the measure to temporary constituencies. Mr. W. E. Forster thought it would be an injustice if it could be said to those who had so long been unjustly kept out of their votes that Parliament had at last given them the right to vote, but as soon as a question of interest that really most concerned them arose they were not to vote. The attitude assumed by Lord R. Churchill surprised many, as suggesting that the recently concluded treaty between the two sections of the Opposition was not very solidly established. He at once announced his opposition to the amendment, holding that the new voters obtained no electoral right until they had been redistributed. "He had been accused of making a friendly arrangement with the Government and playing into the hands of the Liberal party, but a more absurd and ridiculous proposition could not be advanced, and he wished to know which was more likely to be open to that charge—those right hon. gentlemen (indicating the Opposition) or himself. Nearly one-half of the Conservative party were pledged to the assimilation of the county and borough franchise, and that half, he believed, were genuinely anxious to see an extension of the franchise, but they coupled that extension with redistribution. He was under the impression at one time that opposition to reform on principle was upheld by the Conservative party; but the reason why he had altogether departed from that view was that it happened to him in the autumn to make a speech on the question of reform, in which he undoubtedly opposed reform on principle, the delightful experience happened to him that Mr. Balfour Lord Elcho got upon the platform and pointedly and publicly

disagreed with everything he had said. Having found that opposition to reform on principle was not a principle which recommended itself to the Conservative party as a whole, he naturally enough made haste to abandon what was so unpalatable to his friends."

Mr. A. Balfour said Lord Randolph Churchill had informed the House that he had adopted his present opinions on this subject from the desire of being in perfect accord with the Conservative party, but his efforts in that direction, numerous and well-intentioned as they might have been, did not seem to have been crowned with success.

Sir S. Northcote said there were among the Conservative party a considerable number who desired to see the borough and county franchise assimilated; there were also those who did not desire to see it, but who were prepared to acquiesce in it under certain conditions. But whether they were opposed to it, or approved it, or acquiesced in it, or desired it, there was—or at least he had always believed that there was until that afternoon—only one feeling among the Conservative party on this point—that they could not give their sanction to any such Bill unless it were accompanied with a measure of redistribution. "Unless they had some security that a Redistribution Bill was to be introduced and passed they were not justified, upon their own principles, in giving their consent to this measure. How was this to be done? Some said at a later stage of the Bill; others said it was to be done according to the suggestion of Mr. Grey, by fixing a date. He (Sir Stafford) did not like the idea of fixing a date. If a dissolution occurred before the time fixed the House would have to face an awkward situation. If the Government were in earnest in their scheme for redistribution, their supporters would probably be contented with such promises. He was not contented with their promises, not merely because they were Ministerial promises, and he distrusted Ministerial promises, but because he knew very well there were so many circumstances which might interfere to prevent their carrying out this resolution. The Government might say, 'Undoubtedly we meant to do this,' yet the measure might very well be crowded out, and so if a dissolution came Parliament would have to dissolve upon the old measure. Look what a hold you would give the Government if you passed this measure as it was. If the redistribution scheme was not agreed upon, they would have to fall back upon the Bill of 1884, and thus they would find themselves caught and entirely at the mercy of Her Majesty's Government. It was said the House of Lords should not be given the power to stop a Reform Bill. If the House of Lords desired to do so they certainly had that power, Mr. Grey's object might be the same as that of Colonel Stanley, but it was doubtful whether that amendment would accomplish it. They would put a great weapon into the hands of the Government if they enabled them to say, 'We will dissolve Parliament if you object to such and such a course.'"

Lord R. Churchill thereupon again rose and said that in all that had fallen from the leader of the Opposition he should entirely concur if it were in their power to compel the Government to adopt the amendment. But the question was, What could they get? There was a difference between that amendment and an amendment which more or less involved the principle of the Bill, an amendment upon which the House had not decided and upon which there was reason to believe that a considerable concurrence of opinion would be arrived at. His object was to relieve the House of Lords from what he believed to be a most dangerous step, that of coming into collision with the House of Commons. He did not see why he should conceal it.

A division was then taken, and Colonel Stanley's motion was defeated (May 23) by 276 to 182. The remaining amendments on Clause 2 were disposed of more summarily. Mr. Stanley Leighton's Educational test (the ability of the voter to write the candidate's name), and Dr. Cameron's proposal to give an elector as many votes as there were candidates to be elected, were withdrawn; and Sir Wm. Barttelot's amendment, making personal payment of rates a necessary qualification, was then negatived, and a very interesting discussion arose on Sir Edward Watkin's proposal to define a "dwelling-house," giving qualification to mean a "tenement containing not less than two habitable rooms." Mr. Gladstone, in reply, disputed altogether the supposition that people could not be capable citizens because they lived in one room. A member of that House could be an elector for Westminster who lived in only one room. In Glasgow 39,000 out of 110,000 electors lived in single rooms, and more than 7,000 were single individuals. In Aberdeen one-fourth of the constituency lived in single rooms. In Edinburgh the number who lived in single rooms were 14,000 out of 52,000—that was to say, more than one-fourth. Lord George Hamilton said that if the Government would undertake to define what constituted a house much of the difficulty would be removed. Sir Charles Dilke said his attention had lately been called to the condition of the one-room population of the country, and the majority of them were very capable citizens indeed. The vast majority of such tenants paid as much as 10*l.* a year for their tenements, and were by no means the poor class they had been represented. Clause 2 was then agreed to, and Clause 3, introducing the new principle of the service franchise, was passed without amendment, and after very brief discussion. On Clause 4, the only amendment of importance was moved from the Radical side by Mr. C. McLaren, who urged the "one man one vote" principle, as the true means of getting rid of faggot votes. He did not go so far as to insist upon residence as absolutely defining the place where a voter should exercise his rights, but he proposed to give each voter who was entitled to be registered in more than one county or borough the right to elect for which county or borough he would be registered. Mr. McLaren's proposal (May 26) was one of many

placed on the order-book indicative of the feelings held by a very large number of the ordinary supporters of the Government, probably by an important majority of those who sat below the gangway, and Mr. Gladstone therefore took this opportunity of explaining the difficulties which had to be met. In introducing the Bill the Government had had to consider the crowded state of the business of the House, and the enormous facilities which that state of business gave for opposition. They knew they would have to contend with the susceptibilities and privileges of the owners of property on the one hand, and, on the other hand, with those who were anxious to push the principle of equality as far as they possibly could. "We came to the conclusion that we had but one course to take, and that was to set ourselves against all changes in the Bill, in whatever direction, that were aimed at an alteration of the basis of the Bill. We do not pretend to offer a perfect system of franchise; we find it entirely out of the reach of possibility. A simple and even a rough method of dealing with the subject was a matter of absolute necessity in the conditions of the case, if we were to have a practical end and aim in view. We have in view a great practical object—that of extending the franchise to numbers who desire it and are qualified to enjoy it. We must go straight to our point, and we must decline to deviate to the right or the left for the purpose of introducing theoretical improvements."

Sir Richard Cross said that the Prime Minister's intention was first to pass the Bill and then to see what could be done, and if there was a chance of giving effect to the amendment to do so. The object of the Government had been expressed by Mr. Chamberlain, who had said that the wisest course would be, first to pass the Bill, and then to dissolve, and then bring in a Redistribution Bill. It was clearly the intention of the Government to follow that order of proceeding. Mr. Gladstone said the Government had uniformly declared at every stage of the Bill that their desire was to pass the Franchise Bill, and that, having passed the Franchise Bill, they should then deal with the subject of redistribution and registration, and then dissolve Parliament. Mr. McLaren refusing to withdraw his amendment, it was rejected by 235 to 43.

At this point the adjournment for the Whitsuntide recess took place, and considerable dissatisfaction was expressed that, after so much time had been expended, so little progress had been made with the one Bill the Government had brought forward. The familiar cry of "veiled obstruction" was met by the retort of "half-hearted anxiety," or "divided counsels," and the speeches of the recess were on both sides rather minatory than critical. Two only attracted any attention—that of Sir M. Hicks-Beach (May 28) at Tewkesbury, and that of Sir Henry James (the Attorney-General) at Bury, in Lancashire, on the following day. The former, whilst recognising that in 1880 the constituencies had virtually endorsed the demand of the agricultural labourers for admission to the

franchise, called upon the Lords to reject a Franchise Bill which the Opposition in the Lower House were unable to modify or withstand. Sir Henry James took up the discussion very much at the point where the previous speaker had left it. He placed the question of a rupture between the two Houses in very plain terms before his hearers, asking them to what purpose were the efforts of the Commons to improve a measure which they were assured beforehand was doomed. He condemned, therefore, as unconstitutional the action of the Conservative peers who had met together (May 10) to give expression to the foregone determination to veto the Bill without knowledge of its actual provisions. He anticipated, however, that the Conservatives in the Lower House would endeavour to graft on to the Bill some proposal which would give the Lords a colourable pretext for rejecting the Bill. He did not anticipate that these tactics would be successful, but even if they were the House of Lords would be but little nearer the object of their wishes. "Do the Peers," he asked, "quite realise the forces against them? History is no safe guide for them now. Many changes have happened since the last great contest. As the strength of the Lords was in 1832, so is it now. The same hereditary peerages exist. The holders have added one generation to their lineage. How far that has given them strength I do not pretend to say. The Irish and Scotch peers, representing no principle save that of co-optation, sitting by no right of hereditary succession, selected by somebody in somebody's drawing-room, are just as they were then. Twenty-one bishops may again record their votes in opposition to the enfranchisement of the people; but such forces have not grown, and are not likely to grow. They have no reserves. There are no intrenched lines for them to fall back upon except those which have been constructed by the good-will of the English people. But now let us review the opposing force. What was it in 1832? What is it now? The population of Great Britain, not including Ireland, was then 16,600,000; it is now 30,500,000. The electorate is difficult to compare, for there was no register in those pre-reform days. National education was unknown; the press was comparatively powerless, the legislation of 1867 was unthought of; political intelligence was inactive, and organisation ineffective. But most men now have entered the active service of political life, and the forces the Lords will have to contend with are many, and determined, and strong. But I believe their sense of certain success will make them moderate. I do not anticipate any whirlwinds or hurricanes of passion; I do not think any coronets or mitres will be blown off; but I do think that there will be humiliation to these Tory Lords, which will weaken the hold their order justly have upon the people now. If no calamitous effects follow, at any rate they incur the peril of a party disaster. What issue to determine by a general election could be more agreeable to the views of an extreme politician than the question whether

the House of Lords or the representatives of the people are to prevail? The condition of things at Khartoum presents many features of interest; but the voice of 2,000,000 Englishmen, asking to be enrolled to take a share in selecting those who have to govern them, will speak more loudly than those who are either for dangerous war or for the total abandonment of Egypt."

A few days later the Marquess of Salisbury, who was heading a campaign in South Devon, gave answer to these threats or warnings of the Attorney-General. Speaking at Plymouth (June 5), he declared openly that whilst he doubted the reality of the demand for an extended franchise, he had no objection to see it accorded. In his eyes the pivot of the whole question was redistribution, and he demanded some assurance that the minority would have some compensation for the influence of the majority. Hitherto in England that compensation had been found by giving to the farmers, who were a conservative class, an "arithmetically excessive" measure of representation, and if they were to lose that, "due representation should be given to the conservative classes, and to the conservative school of thought all through the country"; and this could only be done by a "searching" measure of redistribution. He therefore, though he spoke only for himself, strongly recommended the Lords to throw out the present Bill. The business of the House of Lords was to see that the House of Commons did not falsify the will of the people, "or permanently injure the institutions it was appointed to guard." In the course of a second speech Lord Salisbury remarked that if the doctrine were to be admitted that the House of Commons must be obeyed by the Lords whenever the majority in favour of a measure was large, a modification or repeal of the Septennial Act would become necessary. His definition of the function of the House of Lords was to see that no great change should take place in the institutions of the country without the full knowledge and consent of the people. If, therefore, they thought the Franchise Bill was not desired by the people, or were in doubt on the point, they were bound to reject it, and to give Ministers the choice between leaving it alone during the existing Parliament or of appealing at once to the people to settle it.

The effect of this speech, or manifesto, as it was termed in some quarters, was evident when the House of Commons resumed (June 9) the discussion of the Franchise Bill. The amendments suggested by the Opposition either disappeared or were disposed of with unwonted rapidity. Mr. Elton's amendment to allow *bonâ fide* rent-chargers qualification to vote was met by Mr. Gladstone and the Attorney-General with the contention that something more than a mere money interest was necessary to afford protection against faggot votes, and the amendment was negatived by 162 to 77. The remaining clauses were then agreed to after various amendments had been rejected, some with and others without division. The only interesting discussion arose on

an attempt to revive Sir E. Watkin's definition of a "house" qualification, made by Mr. Raikes, who admitted that he wished the restriction to apply to Ireland, and not to Scotland.

On the next day (June 10), the new clauses proposed to be added to the Bill came under discussion. Mr. Eeroyd was equally unsuccessful in both his efforts to obtain a further recognition of property qualifications. By 168 to 76, the House negatived his clause to enfranchise owners of copyhold and leasehold estates originally created for a term of not less than forty years, and of a clear annual value of 4*l.* and upwards. His other proposal gave rise to longer debate, the clause providing that the voter entitled in respect of the ownership of any freehold, copyhold, or leasehold estate, in a county or borough, should vote for the county or borough wherein such an estate is situate, but that no man should vote for a county for an estate situate within a borough. Mr. Gladstone strongly opposed this attempt to extend the property qualification, and to create a double vote; and, after much discussion, it was rejected by 236 to 114.

The next proposal—the extension of the franchise to women—had given rise to perhaps more discussion outside Parliament than many of the other questions involved in the Franchise Bill. It was one on which diversity of opinion was known to exist on both sides of the House of Commons, and on which freedom from party restraint had hitherto been recognised. Although on more than one occasion the annual motion for the recognition of women's Parliamentary rights had been brought forward by a Conservative, of late years it had fallen to the Radicals to take the more prominent part in the crusade, and to lay before Parliament either a resolution for general endorsement, or a measure embodying their wishes. The Franchise Bill, however, offered a practical means of testing the true strength of the champions of women's rights, and a golden opportunity of giving legislative force to their hopes. Mr. Gladstone, on previous occasions, moreover, although not an enthusiast for the enfranchisement of women, had never expressed any strong disapproval of the proposal; and it was therefore hoped that, even if he would not openly support it on the present occasion, he would at all events decline to intervene actively in the matter. It is true that his principal coadjutor, in defending the Franchise Bill, the Attorney-General (Sir H. James), had over and over again expressed his scorn and dislike of the "fad," but there were other members of the Administration who were equally strong in their desire to mete out an equal measure of justice to both sexes. Professor Fawcett and Mr. Courtney were foremost amongst such, and it was therefore with considerable surprise that the public learnt that the Government had refused to allow women's franchise to be considered an open question. The majority of the Government supporters hastened to assure their leaders that they recognised above all things the claims of party discipline; but the Postmaster-General and the Secretary to the Treasury held their

ground, and even threatened to resign their posts if required to do violence to their consciences. The Independent Radicals, unbound by official or other restraints, openly declared their intention to vote as they pleased; and it remained to be seen how far the Government could find support amongst the Opposition to defeat the wishes of its own adherents. Pressure of no inconsiderable weight was brought to bear upon Mr. Woodall to abandon his clients, and warnings of the danger to which the Franchise Bill was exposed were freely scattered through the Liberal ranks. In moving his clause (June 10), Mr. Woodall maintained that this question had already been fully brought before public notice, and that the declaration signed by 110 members at the commencement of the previous session, that no Franchise Bill would be deemed by them adequate which should fail to enfranchise women, was clear notice to the Government of the wide interest taken in the question. The minute majority by which the resolution in favour of women's suffrage had been in the same session negatived—a majority of only 16—proved, when compared with the majority of 116 by which on a previous occasion the same resolution was defeated, that women's franchise was gaining rapidly in public favour. The Leeds Conference had been strongly in favour of women's suffrage, and the speech made by the Prime Minister himself in 1867 declared that the onus of proof lay on those who regarded women as incapable of properly exercising the suffrage. Mr. Woodall ridiculed the argument that women are politically disqualified on the ground that they do not contribute towards the strength of the army and navy; for on that ground, he said, a great number of the members of the House of Commons would be themselves disfranchised. He insisted on the services rendered by women such as Miss Octavia Hill, Miss Florence Nightingale, the late Mary Carpenter, and others, to social causes, and on the increasing part women are playing every year in the teaching of the people, as well as in other active occupations. There were 20,000 women who were tenant-farmers, and as such the employers of a considerable amount of labour; and he declared that women laboured under many serious legislative and administrative injustices, which would be removed by their adequate representation in Parliament. The women, he reminded the House, were "our own flesh and blood," and Liberals had no right to ask how they would use the franchise if they had once satisfied themselves that it was unjust to refuse it to them.

Mr. Gladstone at once rose to intimate that the Government could not be responsible for the fate of the Bill if this amendment were accepted. He did not wish to argue the case on its merits, and fully recognised the force of some of Mr. Woodall's arguments; but he maintained that nothing would be more improper than to mix up with a Franchise Bill the decision to be taken on a social question of the utmost possible magnitude—one which ought to be entirely dissociated from every party issue, and discussed by the

House as almost sacred in its character, because bearing in so many and various ways on the function and position of women in the community. Mr. Gladstone denied altogether that it was the same thing to accept the aid of women in charities, in education, in the administration of the Poor-law, and to invite them to enter the field of political battle, from which hitherto they had been excluded. He fully admitted that the question was one worthy of the gravest consideration; but it should be taken altogether out of the vortex of political strife, and not mixed up with the fate of a Bill which was avowedly the subject-matter of a great party battle.

On the conclusion of Mr. Gladstone's speech the debate was adjourned, and before the sense of the House could be taken, public opinion had a further opportunity of making itself heard.

The *Times* wrote: "Liberal members must now be under no illusion as to the consequences that would follow if Mr. Woodall's amendment were carried. 'I offer to it,' said the Prime Minister, 'the strongest opposition in my power, and I must disclaim and renounce all responsibility for the measure should my honourable friend succeed in inducing the Committee to adopt his proposal.' There can be no sort of mistake as to the meaning of this declaration. A decision in favour of the amendment would be treated by the Government and regarded by the country as a decision fatal to the Franchise Bill. In these circumstances, it is not surprising that Liberal members who have been willing to give a platonic support to the amendment should now decline to wreck the Franchise Bill by voting for it. This is a plain issue, and the speech of the Prime Minister renders it perfectly easy for Liberal members to accept it, even if they are favourable, in the abstract, to the admission of women to the franchise." The *Standard*, not altogether sorry to see Mr. Gladstone applying to his followers the firm hand with which he coerced his opponents, said: "Mr. Gladstone's speech was no justification whatever of the perpetuation of this striking anomaly, more particularly when we remember that the Bill is one for placing the town and county constituencies on a footing of perfect equality." The *Daily Telegraph* declared: "After such an explicit statement on the part of the Ministry, Liberals—even those most ardently in favour of the proposed change—will feel their hands tied. Mr. Woodall, to whom was entrusted the brief for the ladies, made an able speech, which, under other circumstances, would have had much weight in disarming opposition and securing votes." The *Daily News*, divided in its allegiance, admitted: "If the clause is carried the Government will abandon the Bill. We do not say that Mr. Woodall and his supporters are not fully justified all the same in nailing their colours to the mast and taking a division. But it is fitting to warn the public in general that the numbers who in that case will vote with Mr. Woodall will not by any means represent the number of those who are in favour of the principle of woman suffrage. There can be no question that sooner or later they will win. The

too tardy conversion of the Liberal leaders, however, enabled Mr. Disraeli to claim the credit of giving household suffrage to the nation. Possibly the fame and party advantage of enfranchising women is destined for a Conservative Ministry."

On the resumption of the debate (June 12) Lord John Manners indicated the reasons which commended the proposal to the Conservative squirearchy; whilst Mr. Bryce, on the part of a section of the Radical philosophers, showed that none of our colonies and no single American State had been persuaded to adopt the principle—it had been tried in two territories, but the results had been far from satisfactory. Mr. Goschen ridiculed the idea of excluding married women from votes which were to be given to spinsters and widows, if the object were, as alleged, to enforce the equal rights of wives with their husbands over the custody of their children; and he urged that the examples of women who, like Miss Octavia Hill, had effected much for us in the way of social reform, tended to show what good we get by keeping women out of the storms of politics, and not by launching them into those storms. Finally, he declared boldly that it was not at all for the interests of women themselves that the franchise should be given them. To this speech Sir Stafford Northcote replied by a very strong speech in favour of the amendment, urging that it was as representatives of property that he demanded the vote for women, and held it to be a makeweight in the Conservative scale. But these arguments seem to have had but little weight with the rank and file of the party, for in the division which ensued Mr. Woodall's clause was negatived by 273 to 137—the minority being composed of ninety-eight Conservatives, thirty-one Liberals, and eight Home Rulers—whilst twenty-six Conservatives, with thirteen Home Rulers, voted with 234 Liberals, among whom were many who had up to that time been regarded as favourable to the idea.

The only other point in connection with the Bill which was debated with vigour was that of the date at which the Bill should come into operation. Mr. A. Grey wished to postpone it (June 13) until January 1, 1887, unless Parliament should otherwise determine. Mr. Gladstone objected to what would be practically the suspension of the Act for an indefinite time. He was willing to fix January 1, 1885, as the date of its operation; expressing at the same time the hope of being able to deal with redistribution in the ensuing session. A few days later (June 17) Mr. H. Fowler embodied Mr. Gladstone's suggestion in a definite form, a proposal which was strongly opposed by the Conservative leaders; but Lord R. Churchill announced his intention of supporting it, and suggested that a boundary commission should begin its work during the autumn. Mr. Gladstone, in reply, intimated that it was the intention of the Government not to appoint a royal commission, but to follow the precedent adopted in 1831, when certain gentlemen were instructed to collect information on the boundary

question. After a very strenuous opposition from the Conservatives, Mr. Fowler's clause was agreed to by 256 to 130. Lord Algernon Percy's attempt (June 19) to confer a vote upon every man who paid Income Tax was opposed by the Attorney-General, who declared that the Government would not assent to give the vote to that very light description of property, and the proposal was defeated by 99 to 21. A number of new clauses were then ruled out of order, and the schedules having been agreed to, the Bill was reported as amended. Another night, however, was destined to be lost in confused and useless discussion as to the disabilities which should attach to certain misdemeanours. When the question as originally mooted by Mr. Brinton (June 13), proposing a year's disqualification should follow conviction, was put, Mr. Gladstone and the Attorney-General strongly opposed the clause, which was negatived by 178 to 131. Ten days later a motion of Mr. M. Lloyd, almost identical in substance, was agreed to by 114 to 81—the Attorney-General subsequently adding a rider (198 to 35) to the effect that the disqualification should not apply unless the conviction were on indictment. To this Major Nolan, with the consent and support of the Government, added the further proviso (149 to 111) that the conviction should be by jury. On the question, however, that the clause should stand part of the Bill, Mr. Gladstone remarked that perhaps the Government had made a mistake in assenting to the clause at all, and the House thereupon negatived the proposal by 156 to 102.

At length the final stage in the progress of the Bill through the House of Commons was reached (June 26). In moving the third reading Mr. Gladstone referred to the ominous utterances out of doors threatening the rejection of the Bill. The attitude of the Government hitherto, he said, had been, in Shakespeare's words, "Beware of entrance to a quarrel; but, being in, bear't that th' opposed may beware of thee." At this there were loud cheers and counter-cheers, and Mr. Gladstone went on to combat the pleas by which the Bill had been threatened. In the first place, as regarded the incompleteness of the measure, he repeated his contention that no complete Bill had ever been laid before Parliament, and that to have endeavoured to include redistribution would have been a fraud. Everything had been done to avoid a quarrel. The enfranchisement of the agricultural labourer was a measure calculated to serve the interests of the Conservative party, as was also the service franchise. A collision between the two Houses on this question would open a prospect more serious than any he remembered since the first Reform Bill, and he looked forward to the consequences of it with grave apprehension, although he had no fear of the result. The Government had carefully and strenuously endeavoured to fulfil the sacred duty of preventing such a conflict by all reasonable means.

Sir Stafford Northcote commented on the extraordinary and theatrical speech made by the Prime Minister, the object of which

evidently was to intimidate the House of Lords and to deter it from resisting the will of the majority and an imperious Prime Minister. The Opposition had every reason to distrust the manner in which the Government had dealt with the question, and very little value could be attached to their pledges in reference to redistribution after the persistency with which they had concealed their intentions. The House had been left absolutely without any indication from the Government of the intended disposal of the political forces they were calling into existence. The House of Lords, therefore, would be fully entitled to demand that some more complete scheme should be presented to it. That House, he maintained, was specially bound in a matter of this kind to see that a case was made out, and all the evidence as to the feeling of the country to be found in the paucity of petitions and the recent elections justified them in demanding that the question should be dealt with completely. Any one who denied the right of the House of Lords to deal with the Bill with perfect freedom struck a blow at the Constitution. Mr. Goschen remarked that the debates on the Bill showed that the Conservative party accepted its principle ; and, even if a change of Government were to occur, the country would expect the new Government to introduce a Bill similar to this. The time for opposing the extension of household suffrage to counties was gone by, and he should look to redistribution as the means of doing justice between the old electors and the new. Mr. A. Balfour thought that no more unconstitutional speech had ever been made by a Prime Minister, and augured from his threats being expended on this occasion that he never expected to see this Bill again. If the House of Lords was to be considered incapable of giving its opinion on a great constitutional change of this kind, it would no longer be worth lifting a finger to defend it. Sir Walter Barttelot feared that the tone of dictation adopted by the Prime Minister was calculated to bring about the very result which he affected to deprecate, and expressed his belief that the other House would deal with the Bill in an independent and statesmanlike manner. The Bill was then read a third time *nem. con.* (the Opposition benches being then empty), amid loud cheers from the Ministerial side.

The Bill, however, although it had left the House of Commons, furnished subject for yet another debate (June 27), Mr. Pell calling attention to the entry in the "Votes and Proceedings," that the Bill had been read a third time *nemine contradicente*; whereas when the question was put it was challenged both by the member for West Norfolk (Mr. C. S. Read) and himself. The Speaker stated the record, though unusual, was not without precedent, and that no dissentient voice met his ear. Sir S. Northcote moved to expunge the words "*nem. con.*" from the record, and Mr. Gladstone assented, but Mr. Forster objected to the creation of an undesirable precedent, and the motion was negatived by 125 to 82. On the same evening the Bill was introduced into the House of Lords and read a first time without any remarks.

The public, however, was not long left in suspense as to the intentions of the Opposition in the House of Lords. Earl Cairns at once gave notice (July 1) of his intention to move "that this House, while prepared to concur in a well-considered and complete scheme for the extension of the franchise, does not think it right to assent to the second reading of a Bill having for its object a fundamental change in the electoral body which is not accompanied by provisions which will ensure the full and free representation of the people, by any adequate security that the Bill shall not come into operation except on an entire scheme." That an amendment of this nature, if carried, would amount to a practical rejection of the Ministerial measure was recognised on all sides, but the policy and justification of such a course were keenly debated. The Liberal organs, taking their stand on the fact that the Bill having finally passed the House of Commons without dissent, coupled with repeated admissions by recently-elected Conservative members that the extension of the franchise was inevitable, maintained that the Peers were acting both unwisely and unconstitutionally in provoking a conflict. The Radicals refused to admit the possibility of a dissolution following upon the rejection of the Bill by the Peers, and declared significantly that if such were to happen the reform of the House of Lords would occupy on the hustings a more prominent place in the Radical programme than even the reform of the House of Commons. The right of the Lords, however, to insert a clause giving adequate security against a dissolution before redistribution was recognised as indefeasible, and the rejection of any reasonable amendment would, they admitted, shift the blame from the Conservatives in the Upper to the Liberals in the Lower House. Even the more moderate organs admitted the dangers of an obstinate resistance. Thus the *Times*, of which the sympathies for the Ministry were not very warm, wrote: "Neither blunders in foreign policy nor even flaws in the Franchise Bill itself will weigh for a moment against the vindication of the national will against the obstructiveness of the hereditary Chamber. If not now, then in the autumn, if not in the autumn, then in the spring, what the Peers dislike and oppose must become the law of the land. Their ultimate defeat is as certain as their power to obtain a barren present victory, and the net result of their intended action can only be to weaken their own position, and to bring the revision of their constitution within the domain of practical politics and the scope of eager discussion."

In like manner the *Economist* reviewed the effect of an obstructive policy: "The Peers have chosen the wrong occasion and the wrong time for asserting an authority which, although distinctly constitutional, is only tolerated on condition that it shall not be used except on small occasions, or in accordance with the general view of the majority of the nation. It was quite possible, if no new question were raised, that the country at the next election would be over well disposed towards the Government, when suddenly

the Lords place in the hands of their opponents the most powerful of all cries. They enable the Ministry to overlook disputes about Egypt, to remain silent about foreign policy, to leave all minor proposals undefended, and to ask the electors the single question, whether they intend to be governed by the Lords or by their own elected representatives. To that question there has been, and will be, in England but one reply." At the same time a peer of unimpeachable Conservative views, the Earl of Wemyss, appealed to his order and to the public, through the *Times* (July 5), to allow the Franchise Bill to pass a second reading and to support "an instruction" in Committee securing redistribution before dissolution. The *Standard*, however, which on numerous occasions had shown itself independent of the policy and expressed sympathies of the leaders of the Conservative party, on this point gave them unqualified support. "The boldest course is the safest," it wrote, "and the Lords will reject the Bill. The Government in their treatment of electoral reform have made a mistake, and the sooner they recognise their mistake the better. They cannot, it is true, altogether obliterate the evil impression their tactics have created in the minds of impartial and unprejudiced men, and they certainly do not improve their position by misrepresenting the actual facts or countenancing these idle vapourings about the House of Lords."

These opinions doubtless reflected with general accuracy the tone of the meeting of Conservative peers over which Lord Salisbury had presided, and it was formally announced that a crucial division would take place on Lord Cairns' amendment. In a crowded house, after a preliminary demand by Lord Hardwicke and Lord Redesdale that the Government should state what concessions they were prepared to make, Lord Kimberley moved (July 6) the second reading of the Representation of the People Bill. Having briefly stated the provisions of the Bill, he explained the general results to be that the franchise was placed on the broad foundation of household qualification—one which he hoped would wear for many years. The measure would add two millions to the three millions of voters already on the franchise roll. The number it would add in Ireland was 400,000. He admitted that at first sight this seemed to be an imminent and great danger, but the Government had had to determine what on the whole appeared to be the path of safety. Coming to the amendment of Lord Cairns, he asked whether the Bill was not "a well-considered and complete scheme for the extension of the franchise." Repeating pretty nearly Mr. Gladstone's sketch of the Redistribution Bill contemplated by the Government, he stated that they intended to introduce it next year if they remained in office till that time, and the Bill before their lordships was not to come into operation till January 1866.

Lord Cairns, in moving his amendment, cited Lord Derby and Lord Hartington as authorities against the course taken by the Government in this instance. If the Government were prepared

to accept an amendment that this Bill should not come into operation sooner than their Redistribution Bill, they had only to say so ; but as they had refused that amendment in the House of Commons, the postponement to the Committee stage of such a resolution would be only to postpone the issue on the Bill. He believed in the sincerity of Mr. Gladstone's promise to bring in a Redistribution Bill next year, but circumstances might defeat his intention. They appealed to the country, and asked to be judged by the country. They had received a considerable quantity of advice and some menace. The latter had come mainly from one quarter, and, coming from that quarter, it was neither fitting nor constitutional. He asked their lordships to be neither deterred by menace from supporting his amendment nor provoked by menace to support it if they did not think it was one which the House ought to approve.

The Duke of Argyll replied to Lord Cairns in a very moderate but very vigorous speech, argued from the "Cross-Bench" point of view, in which he maintained that the House of Lords would be far more powerful than it was if there were a great many more peers who thought for themselves and repudiated mere party leadership ; and he maintained that such peers would accept this Bill as a very moderate and reasonable measure, and as one which, even if it regulated a general election without the passing of any Redistribution Bill, would, nevertheless, return a Parliament favourable to such a Redistribution Bill as the rural party would most approve. What the Duke of Argyll euphemistically termed the "nervousness" of the House of Lords about redistribution was, he declared, sure to be misunderstood by the country as hostility to reform.

The Duke of Richmond strongly supported the amendment, but Lord Jersey thought that their lordships ought not to wantonly excite the working classes against that House ; and as he believed they would do so by refusing to read this Bill a second time, he felt reluctantly compelled to vote against his party. Lord Fife also supported the second reading, and expressed his opinion that if a Redistribution Bill were not passed next year, that would be owing to the wild spirits of the Conservative party. Lord Cowper, in an earnest speech against the resolution, urged that if they adopted it the impression created would be that they wanted to force a dissolution. If they succeeded in doing this they would not at best make much by the move, because it would be felt that they appealed to dead constituencies. Lord Waterford argued against the Bill because of its probable effect in Ireland in enfranchising large masses of the ignorant and disloyal class, and he expressed his belief that it would be impossible to govern Ireland if the Bill passed. Lord Fitzgerald having referred to the popular outbreaks which followed the obstruction of the Reform Act of 1832 and the measure introduced by Lord Russell in 1867, warned their lordships against

the adoption of the amendment. Lord Dunraven, while approving generally the provisions of the Bill, thought that security should be taken for the passing of a Redistribution Bill. The Duke of Marlborough, at some length, argued against the course resolved upon at Lord Salisbury's, contending that the impression created by it on outsiders must be unfavourable to the Conservative party. Lord Cadogan admitted that the Bill was moderate in its principles and conservative in its tone, and he viewed the equalisation of the county and borough franchise as a sequence of household suffrage; but he supported the amendment because he held it to be essential that an addition to the franchise should be accompanied by a redistribution of the electoral power. Lord Morley closed the discussion for the night by explaining the reasons which made it impossible to pass a Franchise Bill and Redistribution Bill in the same session.

The second evening's debate was opened by an elaborate and carefully-prepared speech by Lord Carnarvon, who reviewed with delicate irony the results of the two great Reform Acts, which had abolished small boroughs, the nursery of our ablest statesmen, destroyed the representation of colonial interests, broken the old and close connection which used to exist between the two Houses of Parliament, lessened the representation of labour, increased expense and corruption at elections, destroyed the old continuous policy which used to mark the government of the country under successive administrations, prevented the fair distribution of political power from keeping pace with enfranchisement, and turned members of the House of Commons from representatives into delegates. Still, and as matters stood, Lord Carnarvon was quite willing to give a new and large extension of the franchise, but pleaded hard for giving with it a fair redistribution of political power. At the same time he was not willing to give a blind acceptance to the Bill of the Government, as satisfactorily settling the details of the enfranchisement, for he did not like the way in which it dealt with Ireland. He complained that no provision was made for the representation of minorities, and he wanted to know why women were to be excluded from the franchise. He supported the demand for concurrent redistribution by apt quotations from Lord Derby, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, Mr. Fawcett, and Mr. Trevelyan; and, turning to the attacks made upon the Upper House, he hinted a dignified rebuke of "political Billingsgate" and "monotonous, stupid, and ridiculous threats," while he turned aside with something approaching to contempt alike from "the candid friends who warn" and from "the timid friends who see a lion in every path." That the country should be "angry" with the Peers for rejecting the Bill he did not believe; political clubs might be angry, but not the country, to whose decision the House of Lords desired to refer the question. The action of their lordships "might be misrepresented, but could not be misunderstood," and he invited them

with some confidence to "dare to be brave," throwing on the Government, who could even now settle the whole matter by a timely concession, the responsibility for whatever might happen. The strange spectacle of "a popular Government with a popular Minister—the favourite of the people—at its head," shrinking from "an appeal to the source of its strength, was difficult to understand. Lord Carnarvon could only account for it by the supposition that the Prime Minister was "haunted by the memory of Midlothian, of the Transvaal, or of Egypt."

Lord Derby declined to follow Lord Carnarvon in his funeral oration over the grave of the Bill. He asked the Opposition whether the people at large would believe that in carrying the amendment they did not mean to oppose an extension of the franchise. The people would judge not by words, but by acts. He believed that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the country recognised the revising powers of that House, but there was just the one out of a hundred cases in which they did not recognise it. Such cases had been the Irish Church and Land Bills. As to the question of redistribution, he admitted that a general election under the extended franchise without redistribution would cause much confusion in our political arrangements, and they ought to do what they could to prevent it; but that inconvenience would only be temporary, whereas he held that to give either branch of the Legislature a retrospective power of preventing the operation of an Act of Parliament would be an unconstitutional proceeding.

Lord Brabourne having expressed his regret that the action of the Government obliged him to go into the lobby against them, Lord Rosebery assured him of their sympathy, for he (Lord Brabourne) had had to do this so often that his coronet must have become a crown of thorns. As to the Bill, approval of it had been expressed by almost every noble lord who had spoken on it, and yet it was to be rejected. While holding that the House had a constitutional right to reject this Bill, he denied that it had a moral right to do so, seeing that the measure was one particularly affecting the House of Commons and not affecting the members of their lordships' House, except in the way that it did all Her Majesty's subjects. He suggested to the Opposition that they had nothing to gain, but much to lose, by the passing of the amendment. The army of the noble leader of the Opposition might fade away if the Bill were presented to them a second time; and Lord Salisbury knew what it was to lead a storming party and find himself alone in the breach. That a dangerous agitation would follow the rejection of the Bill might be regarded as a certainty.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in a short speech, and as matter of duty, expressed his hearty concurrence in the object of the Bill, declaring that the Church trusted the people and that no Churchmen were so good Churchmen as those who were also working men.

The Lord Chancellor, after pointing out that in 1832 Lord

Lyndhurst had persuaded the House of Lords to pass a resolution intended to wreck the great Reform Bill, which was the very reverse of that tendered by Lord Cairns, since it asserted that you must fix your franchise first and your redistribution afterwards, described Lord Salisbury's policy by a nickname of Lord Salisbury's own giving, "the policy of the ostrich"—a creature which seems to think that by concealing danger from itself it conceals itself from the danger, the only principle on which it could be pretended that the policy now recommended to the Lords was safe.

The Marquess of Salisbury then rose, and, in a speech abounding rather in satire than invective, he attacked the plans of the Government more than the policy of the Bill. In a somewhat sharp rejoinder upon the speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury, he denied that the Episcopal Bench had any monopoly of admiration for the working-man or of desire to advance his weight in the Constitution. He then drew attention to the tone in which both Lord Derby and the Lord Chancellor had spoken of redistribution as indicating that the Government were not inclined to push forward their redistribution scheme with too much vigour; and he pointed out that the extension of the new franchise to Ireland seriously menaced the integrity of the empire. To the plea that the Opposition might have got all they wanted by inserting an amendment in Committee, he gave the telling answer that the House of Lords had had "considerable experience of the value of passing amendments in Committee already," for the Government would certainly resist any proposal to defer the operation of the Bill, and it would never ultimately be carried out. As to the promise to introduce a Redistribution Bill next session, what was wanted was not a Redistribution Bill alone, but the power to modify it if unjust. "Why do not the Government," he asked, "say they will put a clause in the Bill to prevent its coming into operation without redistribution? If they will do that, the whole difficulty is at an end. If they refuse it, on them and not on us lies the responsibility of whatever may happen." Then, in a lighter vein, he bantered "the patron of Midlothian," as he styled Lord Rosebery, for weak passages in some of his highest flights of rhetoric, and extracted considerable amusement from the speech delivered on the previous evening by Lord Fitzgerald, who had solemnly warned the House of possible consequences by referring to the Bristol riots which took place over the Reform Bill of 1832, who had told them that the present Houses of Parliament were "built by the side of the river in order that the Conservative majority might escape by penny steamers in case the people rose against them," and who had reminded them that the Archbishop of Canterbury of that day had to fly by a back door because he voted against reform—a reminder which Lord Salisbury held accountable for the alacrity with which the present occupant of the see had hastened to the support of the present measure.

Earl Granville, on behalf of the Government, in a very brief

speech, contended that the Government had offered every reasonable security for the introduction of a Redistribution Bill, and, with the concurrence of his colleagues, he told their lordships that if the Government failed to introduce such a Bill next year, they would be open to the grave charge of an absolute breach of faith.

A division was then taken, and the amendment was carried by 205 to 146, mainly on party lines. Five Conservative peers voted with the Government, and six Liberals with the Opposition. Both the archbishops and ten bishops were in the minority, and only one (Bristol and Gloucester) supported Earl Cairns. Lord Tennyson voted with the Government. Lord Sherbrooke was absent.

Although the acceptance of Lord Cairns' amendment did not necessarily imply the formal withdrawal of the Franchise Bill, it was accepted on all sides as fatal to the subsequent progress of the measure. The condition imposed was one which the Government had from the first refused to admit, and one on which the Opposition in the House of Commons had failed to show that there was division of opinion among the Liberal party. The debate on the Franchise Bill, consisting of only a dozen clauses, had occupied the House of Commons from the end of February to the end of June; and this experience was sufficient to give force to the contention of the Government that want of time was not merely an excuse for the non-production of their scheme, but a well-grounded reason. Whether some middle course might not have been hit upon had both parties been really anxious to settle the question on a mutually satisfactory basis, was one of those speculations left to philosophers remote from the busy scene of party strife. For those who were engaged there was no sign that either side desired to keep the question before the public, each in turn claiming to have the public weal alone at heart, whilst each party loudly accused the other of provoking a crisis, which both declared they wished to avoid. The *Times* declared that the Peers had incurred something which they ought to fear more than the threats of agitators, namely, the reasoned condemnation of moderate and thoughtful politicians—a body of persons whom the *Standard* characterised as mistaking their own frenzy for the mood of the nation, and who arrogated to themselves the mission of speaking in the name of the English people. Meanwhile the Government was not left without strong, if not clear, indications of the course it ought to take, and Mr. Gladstone, recognising at once the existence of a more or less widely-spread feeling, at once set himself to direct its course and to indicate its proper aim. A meeting of the Liberal party was forthwith called together (July 10) at the Foreign Office, to hear the Premier's statement. His speech on the action of the Lords dwelt on two great points. One was the entire novelty of the assertion that the Lords, who had no constituents, had a right to compel an appeal to the country whenever they chose to imagine that the country had changed its mind and wished to return a

different House of Commons. That was the right, said Mr. Gladstone, of the Ministry of the day, whenever it was of that opinion; but then it sent its own adherents to the country, as well as the adherents of its antagonists; whereas, in the claim of the House of Lords to do likewise there was no equality of position, since it hazarded nothing, while it put the country to the cost of a general election. His next point was, that the Government had actually offered the leader of the Tories in the House of Lords a compromise during the recent struggle. They had proposed to pass in both Houses an identical resolution, declaring that each House had passed the Franchise Bill in reliance on the promise of the Government to introduce a Redistribution Bill next session, and to embody this resolution in an address to the Crown, so that all three elements of the Legislature would be in possession of this pledge. This proposal was rejected by Lord Salisbury, on the ground that he was not going to discuss the Redistribution Bill "with a rope round his neck"—that is, a Franchise Act under which, if at all, the party must appeal to the people.

The speech in which the Premier a few hours later announced to the House of Commons the intention of the Government was marked by a studied moderation of tone. "The Government," said Mr. Gladstone, "consider it their first and paramount duty to secure by the proper and constitutional and regular method, at the earliest possible date, the passing of the Franchise Bill, the principles of which have received—in the House of Commons by positive votes, in the House of Lords by words not deficient in force—the assent of both Houses of Parliament." The method he proposed to adopt was an autumn session, at which the Franchise Bill would be the only business brought forward by the Government, and in order to prepare for this session he proposed to sacrifice all the measures which threatened to give rise to protracted discussion, to push forward Supply, and to bring the session to a close as speedily as feasible. Although Sir S. Northcote was disposed to drop further discussion on the crisis at that moment, such was not the view of Lord R. Churchill, who bitterly assailed the Prime Minister and his colleagues for having deliberately and intentionally brought about the existing state of affairs, of which they were now afraid to assume the responsibility. He added that if on the third reading of the Franchise Bill Mr. Gladstone had spoken in the terms of conciliation which marked his utterance of that evening, the Bill by that time would have been well on its way towards receiving royal assent.

On the following day a good deal of the mystery which had hung over the fate of the Reform Bill in the House of Lords, prior to the debate on Earl Cairns' resolution, was removed.

Mr. Gladstone, in his speech at the Foreign Office, had said that the compromise suggested by the Government was rejected "because the leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords said he could not discuss redistribution with a rope round his neck."

When the House of Commons met there was much curiosity as to the exact value of such words, and in answer to general expectation Sir S. Northcote rose and said: "I wish to state, on behalf of Lord Salisbury, that he never made use of that expression or anything of the sort. What Lord Salisbury really did say was this: 'No Government, not even the most powerful, can ensure as a matter of absolute certainty that a Redistribution Bill should be passed before the dissolution.' But even if it were passed, should we be any better? My lords, what we want is not only a Redistribution Bill, but a Redistribution Bill that we can handle; something if manifestly unjust we should be able to modify. How should we be able to modify it if we had this pistol put to our heads: 'Unless you pass this Bill you shall have no Bill at all, and you go to the country with a new enfranchisement on the old constituencies?' We shall have no power over such a Bill, and, therefore, not even if they were able absolutely to promise, they could not, if they once allowed this measure to pass out of their and our hands, engage to us that we should have a free hand in modifying the details of redistribution."

But it was in the House of Lords that the fullest explanation of the secret negotiations was made by Lord Salisbury. On the second evening of the debate (July 8) Lord Cairns had made known to him a communication between Lord Granville and himself. He was of opinion that the offer made by the Government did not give any greater security than would exist without it for the passing of a Redistribution Bill, and that therefore it could not be accepted. He understood from Lord Cairns that the communication from the Government was absolutely informal and confidential, and therefore he felt bound to make no allusion to it in debate. He characterised as an utter fabrication the statement that he had said he could not discuss redistribution with a rope round his neck, and he asked whether it was with poisoned weapons of that sort that the fight with their lordships' House was about to be conducted.

Lord Granville at once rose to give the Ministerial version of the recent negotiations, and proceeded to read from a paper the following memorandum of what had occurred: "On Tuesday I called on Lord Cairns in his private room at the House of Lords before the orders of the day were read. I said that notwithstanding my former success in averting differences between the two Houses I did not feel sanguine now, and was only induced to trouble him because it had been suggested by a Conservative peer that I should do so, and also by the assurance which he (Lord Cairns) gave in his speech that a special provision offered by the Government might settle the whole matter. I asked him whether he could make any suggestion. Lord Cairns made a suggestion which, though not in similar words, was the same in substance as Colonel Stanley's clause. I stated that such an arrangement was impossible for the Government to accept. I then suggested for

his consideration that the Government should pledge themselves, if the House of Lords passed the present Bill, to propose an identical resolution in both Houses reciting that they have passed the Representation of the People Bill in reliance on the engagement tendered by Her Majesty's Ministers that they will, so far as depends on them, introduce and use every effort in their power to pass in the ensuing session a Bill for the redistribution of seats in the United Kingdom, and a joint address by both Houses laying the same resolution at the foot of the throne. The noble and learned earl asked whether I could give my words in writing, and after my having done so whether he might show them to the noble marquess. Later in the evening he returned my paper with the observation that 'this does not appear to give any higher security than that which is already given by the assurance of the Government. If the Government admitted an amendment, either (1) that the Bill should come into operation on a day to be named in a subsequent Act of Parliament, or (2) should come into operation on January 1, 1886, unless an earlier day was named in an Act to be passed next session, it would be sufficient.' I communicated this result to Mr. Gladstone, and we agreed that the refusal of the leaders of the Opposition was not decisive against our making the proposal to the House of Lords. But I had received an appeal for an adjustment from a Conservative peer, not on the front bench, who expressed a desire on the part of himself and some other peers to find a means of avoiding a vote against the Bill. I therefore sent him the proposal, which he returned with an intimation that it was not sufficient. Under these circumstances the Lord Chancellor and I were of opinion that it was not desirable to make a proposal in the House of a somewhat novel character, as it was sure to be rejected by those to whom it was addressed."

Lord Cairns said he had regarded the communications between himself and Lord Granville as entirely private and confidential, and he would sooner have cut off his hand than have spoken of them to any one without permission. Not understanding exactly what Lord Granville meant when he made his proposal in words, he asked him to put it on paper, and to permit him to show it to Lord Salisbury. Lord Granville complied. His subsequent communication with Lord Salisbury on the subject was very brief, and he was quite sure his noble friend said nothing about a rope round his neck.

In the House of Commons Lord Randolph Churchill called attention to the same subject, and Mr. Gladstone, after making the statement which he had made in the letter to Lord Granville as to the words of Lord Salisbury, denied absolutely that his proposal was in any sense whatever private and confidential, being, on the contrary, essentially intended as the basis of a "public proceeding of the most responsible kind." In the letter offering the suggestion there was no word to indicate a confidential document, and no word was used by Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville of that kind. Indeed, the proposal was mentioned to other peers besides

Lord Cairns and Lord Salisbury. Lord Randolph Churchill then charged Mr. Gladstone with proclaiming "secret and confidential communications," and Mr. Gladstone in the warmth of his retort was called upon by the Speaker to withdraw an expression. But this "squall" passed as rapidly as it had arisen. Lord R. Churchill hastened to explain his language, and to implore the Government to build a golden bridge for their opponents, and Mr. Gladstone paid a generous tribute to the talents of the leader of the Fourth party, which at that moment was credited with the desire to throw in its lot with the Government on the franchise question, bringing over with them as a contingent a large number of the Conservative peers, who were represented as having been annoyed and nettled by the communications which had passed between the party leaders without their knowledge. Mr. Sclater-Booth, on behalf of the moderate Conservatives, who had had the responsibility of office, expressed regret that some understanding had not been arrived at, and Mr. Whitbread, the most liberal of Whigs, hoped that the door would be kept open.

A little later in the evening Mr. Gladstone had an opportunity of explaining to the members of the "Eighty Club" the position of affairs. He expressed his belief that had the Tory party welcomed the extension of the franchise vast numbers of the newly-enfranchised would have sympathised with and supported the Conservatives. Their leaders, however, had done everything to throw them into the arms of the Liberal party. Nevertheless, even should the extended electorate return a Conservative majority Mr. Gladstone declared that he would not repent his act. As to the conflict on which the two Houses had now entered, "We shall certainly endeavour," said Mr. Gladstone, "to avoid raising any ulterior question of organic change until and unless—which God forbid—experience shall finally prove that a hard and irresistible necessity compels it. Our hope and desire are that this Bill will in three months be what is termed reconsidered. It is not our desire to see it carried by storm and tempest, but to see it win its way by persuasion and calm consideration to the rational minds of men. We believe that there has been very great reluctance on the part of the majority of the Peers who struck the blow to do the act which they have done, not without much misgiving. Our earnest hope is that full scope and free play may be allowed to every honest, liberal, and prudent sense, and that without terror, but simply by a wise and rational consideration of the position and its duties, that most unfortunate vote may be removed."

For a moment there was a break in the clouds. The Franchise Bill, it was thought, might yet pass through the House of Lords if the desires which seemed to animate the leaders of both parties were allowed free scope. With this view the Earl of Wemyss, who, in spite of his attachment to the Conservative party, had voted against Lord Cairns' resolution, gave notice of his intention to move: "That this House being now in possession of full know-

ledge of all that has passed with reference to the Franchise Bill, the principle of which has already been accepted by this House, is of opinion that it should be proceeded with and considered with a view to its being passed in the present session; and this House is further of opinion that an humble address should be presented to Her Majesty humbly praying Her Majesty to summon Parliament to assemble in the month of October next for the purpose of considering the Redistribution Bill which Her Majesty's Ministers have undertaken to use their best endeavour to pass so soon as the Franchise Bill has received the royal assent."

Unfortunately for those who sincerely desired a compromise, those who on each side hoped to gain more by a policy of "No Surrender" were first in possession of the field. If the Conservative press and some Conservative politicians had spoken unadvisedly as to the rôle of the House of Peers, the Liberals were not slow in trying to arouse popular feeling against that body. At meetings summoned by their local associations the Liberals, and especially the Radicals, denounced in unmeasured language the obstacles thrown by the Peers in the way of legislation. Politicians of an extreme shade, who found the House of Commons uncongenial for the ventilation of their projects of reform, poured out in the daily press or on evening platforms their bitterest denunciations of an effete anomaly, and demonstrations were made in Hyde Park and the suburbs, as well as in the provinces, against a constitutional branch of the Legislature.

The magnitude of these difficulties became daily more apparent. When Lord Wemyss publicly gave notice (July 14) of his resolution, the divergence of views was at once seen. Differing somewhat from the original draft, it invited the House to proceed forthwith with the consideration of the Franchise Bill on the understanding that Parliament would be summoned in the early autumn for the purpose of considering the Redistribution Bill which the Government had undertaken to introduce. In a brief speech Lord Salisbury quarrelled with the terms of the motion, condemned it as informal and disorderly, complained of the shortness of the notice, and plainly indicated his determination to meet it with uncompromising resistance. In reply to an inquiry by Lord Rosebery, Lord Granville announced that the Government would be prepared to support the resolution, only reserving the question of the exact date at which it might be possible to introduce a Redistribution Bill. On the assumption that the Franchise Bill was passed before the close of the session, the Government, said Lord Granville, would be prepared to enter upon the great task of redistribution early in November. As far as the Government was concerned, therefore, there were no obstacles to a compromise.

Meanwhile, however, a meeting of the Conservative party had been summoned, and on its assembling at Carlton House (July 15) it was clear that Lord Salisbury had nailed his colours to the mast of his ship. He represented, and the feeling was endorsed by a

large majority of those present, that the so-called compromise was no compromise at all, for the House of Lords would be left without any guarantee that a satisfactory Redistribution Bill would be passed before an appeal was made to the enlarged constituencies. The result of this decision was made plain when Lord Wemyss two days later (July 17) rose to move his resolution from the cross-benches. He explained that he had postponed his proposal solely in consequence of Mr. Gladstone's conciliatory speech in the House of Commons (July 11), and he pointed out that the adoption of his resolution would not prevent the Opposition from seeking to obtain in Committee a further concession in addition to that which the Government made in supporting his motion. He accused those who were opposed to compromise of fencing for a dissolution, and he expressed much doubt whether a dissolution following the rejection of the Franchise Bill would be to the advantage of the Conservative party. The Bill having passed through the House of Commons by large and frequent majorities, and its principle having been accepted by their lordships' House, he held that if the Conservative party took their stand on its rejection they would be standing on mined and rotten ground.

Lord Shaftesbury, in seconding the resolution, said that he did so because he was deeply impressed with the gravity of the situation. In his opinion the crisis of 1832 was not to be compared to the existing crisis. There were large numbers of people who were anxious for the franchise but cared nothing about redistribution. By rejecting the Bill before the House their lordships would be exasperating present and future constituencies, and encouraging them to place themselves more under the influence of pernicious agitation.

Lord Cadogan moved, as an amendment, that in the opinion of the House it would be desirable that Parliament should assemble at an early period of the autumn to consider the Representation of the People Bill, already presented to Parliament, in conjunction with the Redistribution Bill which Her Majesty's Ministers had undertaken to present to Parliament. He recognised the fact that there was a spirit of compromise in the air, but he maintained that the Government had offered no concession. The Secretary for Foreign Affairs, when intimating the readiness of the Government to accept Lord Wemyss's resolution, stated that they could not have a Redistribution Bill prepared till the end of November or the beginning of December. What, then, was there to prevent them from getting the Representation of the People Bill again through the House of Commons early in the autumn, sending it up to their lordships' House, and then introducing the Redistribution Bill in the House of Commons?

Lord Dunraven opposed the resolution, and suggested that there should be an adjournment of Parliament instead of a prorogation, and that thus the Bill could be brought before the Lords without being sent up by the Commons again. The Duke of Somerset agreed

with the resolution. The Duke of Norfolk, who had supported the Government on the previous occasion, explained the reasons which prevented him from following Lord Wemyss, nothing having occurred in the interval to induce the Peers to abandon the position they had then taken up. Lord Aberdeen, on the other hand, thought that in acceding to the terms of Lord Wemyss' motion the Government were making a great concession.

Lord Salisbury, confining himself to the real issue before the House—whether their lordships were able to accept a compromise such as was put forward—expressed his opinion that, in consequence of the speech of the Prime Minister to his party at the Foreign Office (July 10), the matter of redistribution stood in a very different position from what it did when the division was taken on Lord Cairns' amendment. The members of the House who on that occasion spoke from the Treasury Bench argued that the difficulty which prevented the Government from passing a Franchise Bill and a Redistribution Bill in the same session was a mechanical one; but Mr. Gladstone, speaking to his supporters, avowed that he intended to use the passing of the Representation of the People Bill as a lever by which he might compel the Opposition in both Houses to accept whatever scheme of redistribution he might offer to Parliament. An issue had therefore been raised in respect of which he saw no room for compromise. How could the House of Lords withdraw from the principle it affirmed—that the extension of the franchise and redistribution must go together? By the form in which the Peers had affirmed that principle they had kept the Bill alive. If it were killed by a prorogation, that would be the act of Her Majesty's Government, and not of that House; and if Her Majesty's Government sent the Bill up on the same terms in the autumn, it was very probable that the Peers would again refuse to accept it without a Redistribution Bill, and leave with Ministers the responsibility of killing it a second time. There were two reasons for not accepting a promise of a Redistribution Bill—one, that circumstances were stronger than men, and the other, that though the Government might promise to bring in a Bill, they did not and could not promise what that Bill was to be. He appealed therefore to his hearers not to be led away by empty epithets. He asked them to disregard transitory clamour, and to do their duty to their Queen and country, despite dangers, real or imaginary, which the minds of over-troubled advisers might conjure up.

Lord Granville's reply was listened to with less sympathy than his speeches were accustomed to enlist in an assembly where he was the leader of a minority. He expressed a strong disbelief in Lord Salisbury's desire for an extended franchise, whilst Mr. Gladstone's recognised earnestness in its favour might suggest that the latter would do all in his power to achieve his object. The Government were, moreover, asked to turn against the remarkable majorities which in the House of Commons had supported their proposals, and to follow the dictates of a majority in the House of

Lords which fell very far short of the normal preponderance of the Conservative party in the latter assembly. After a few other remarks a division was taken, and Lord Wemyss' resolution was defeated by 182 to 132, and Lord Cadogan's amendment was adopted without a division as a substantive motion.

With this the question of the Franchise Bill in Parliament virtually closed for the session. The two parties had taken up their respective positions for the autumn campaign—and each was busy in fortifying its outworks and bracing up its energies for the struggle in prospect. The tactics of the Conservatives were not difficult to appreciate. They believed that on an appeal to the existing constituencies they had a fair chance of recovering much, if not all, of the ground lost in 1880—whilst they anticipated, in spite of the enormous increase of the county voters, very few advantages from an appeal interposed between extension and redistribution. The *Quarterly Review* for July summed up the position of affairs in the dictum, "So far from resisting the popular will, the Lords insist upon its expression being elicited, and at the present crisis they alone can utter the *appello Cæsarem*." On the other side, the thoughtful members of the Liberal party agreed with Mr. Fawcett in his keen sense of the unfitness of an excited populace to deal with constitutional questions; whilst only the most reckless agitators exulted in the prospect of seeing the Government raise before the ballot-boxes the question of the obstructiveness of the Peers.

The first direct result was the mass meeting held in Hyde Park (July 21) attended by numbers variously estimated from 40,000 to 100,000, amongst whom were numerous delegates from the unenfranchised labourers of the home counties. The procession, which was of imposing proportions, assembled on the Thames Embankment, and marched by way of Parliament Street, Charing Cross, Pall Mall, and Piccadilly to Hyde Park, where, at seven platforms, speeches were delivered and identical resolutions passed by acclamation. The proceedings throughout were good-humoured and orderly, and it was admitted on all sides that the crowd of spectators along the route and in the park far outnumbered the processionists. In the House of Commons the Home Secretary was closely questioned as to the line of route adopted, the long détour by Parliament Street not only bringing the procession within the limits proscribed for public meetings, but being neither so direct nor convenient as the obvious way by Northumberland Avenue. Sir W. Harcourt's disclaimer of all personal knowledge as well as of official responsibility was received with general incredulity; but, as no ill results had followed, the matter was at length allowed to drop.

Beyond this the Franchise Bill was not further alluded to, even incidentally, in the House of Commons, but in the House of Lords the Earl of Redesdale, on more than one occasion, raised a debate upon the subject. In calling attention to the proposed autumn

session (July 22) he recommended the Government to bring forward their Bill for the Representation of the People in two parts, one dealing with the franchise, to be discussed in the Commons whilst the Lords were dealing with the other relating to redistribution. Parliament might be adjourned over Christmas as soon as the Commons had passed the franchise section of the Bill, and on its reassembling could take up redistribution. Lord Granville replied that the Government adhered to their plan of getting the Franchise Bill through both Houses before introducing their redistribution scheme. A fortnight later (August 5) Lord Redesdale returned to the point and asked whether it was the intention of the Government, in accordance with the expressed wish of the House and with the precedents of other Reform Bills, to introduce provisions for redistribution in the Bill to be brought forward in the autumn session; but to this inquiry Lord Granville gave the very short and significative reply that the intention of the Government was to re-introduce the Franchise Bill in the shape in which it had been rejected by that House. A week later (August 11) Lord Kimberley, in reply to a similar invitation from Lord Redesdale, declined to give any further indications as to the lines upon which their redistribution scheme would be based; the general principles had been explained, but the details would be reserved until the Bill was formally introduced. The Franchise Bill would be brought in at the commencement of the autumn session, and when it had been passed by Parliament the Redistribution Bill would be brought in.

But the interest in and control of the question had meanwhile passed from Parliament to the public platforms, and both parties were active in showing how far they had popular sympathy and support. The Conservative leaders were first in the field. Lord Salisbury, with his accustomed boldness, determined to carry the war into the heart of the enemy's country, and at a large meeting at Sheffield (July 22) he reviewed the conduct of the Government during the session. He said they had suddenly had all the measures with which Parliament had been laboriously dealing during the last few months thrown violently aside, for no reason that he could find except that the Prime Minister was behaving like a man who, having met with some domestic quarrel, broke all his crockery to show how much he felt it. He had thrown away all the valuable labours of the session, not because anything that had happened made it in any degree more difficult to pass them, but simply in order to make a splash and draw attention to the rebuff which his policy had received. Lord Salisbury claimed that the House of Lords only exercised its proper function in refusing to allow the party now in power to force on the country a Redistribution Bill which would enable the Government to so manipulate the re-arrangement of the constituencies as to secure their perpetual retention of office. The House of Commons was the most servile House that ever existed in Westminster,—the

most servile to the Prime Minister, the most servile to the caucus. It was discredited at every by-election. The Lords were charged with the crime of not allowing the alteration of the Constitution on an unsound, partisan, and inequitable basis; they, in reply, demanded an appeal to the people at the polling-booths, but the Government dared not make that appeal because they knew that delusive hopes, broken promises, oceans of blood unnecessarily shed, weakened prestige and power abroad, a distracted empire, and a discontented Ireland, would be brought up against them, and an account demanded. He concluded his bitter philippic:—

“The Government set up all sorts of shams and counterfeits. They descend into the streets—they call for processions. They imagine that 30,000 Radicals going to amuse themselves in London on a given day express the public opinion of the country. That is not the way in which a progressive, cultured, and civilised State determines the opinions of its citizens. Nothing could have been more good-humoured as yet than the multitudes of their own partisans whom they have summoned into the streets to keep them in countenance. But they appeal to the streets. They attempt legislation by picnic. That has its dangerous side as well. There is no more hopeless condition in which a popularly-governed State can be plunged than when its policy is decided by demonstrations held in the streets of the metropolis, and to that end I am afraid the Government would be very sorry to come. At all events, they will resist to the best of their power the legitimate appeal. But we must keep the truth in this matter clearly before our eyes. If they do not want the opinion of the people, if they are content to go on with the ordinary constitutional powers of the two Houses of Parliament, it is open for them to do so, and I have no doubt the business of the country will not seriously suffer. A party can speak by processions and demonstrations, but the nation can only speak at the polling-booths, and any attempt to substitute the counterfeit voice which is manufactured by the caucus will assuredly not lead to a true ascertainment of the feelings of the people, and will be bitterly and indignantly repudiated when the people have their voice.”

The same evening, Sir Stafford Northcote, addressing a meeting at King's Lynn in support of the candidature of Lord Cranborne, dwelt principally on the Franchise Bill, which, he declared, could not properly be passed unaccompanied by a Redistribution Bill. The only true solution of the difficulty which had arisen between the Upper and Lower Chambers of Parliament was an immediate appeal to the electors. He charged the Government with having slept over the mission of Reform, which they said was given to them at the last general election, until it suited their purposes as a party.

Lord Salisbury's visit to Sheffield had preceded Lord R. Churchill's by only a few hours, and although no opportunity offered for the spokesmen of the two most important groups of

Conservatives to explain their respective programmes, many of the delegates to the Conservative National Union must have listened to Lord Salisbury's address. On the following day (July 23) the annual meeting of that body took place at Sheffield, and was attended by 450 delegates of Conservative Clubs and Associations. The proposals made by Earl Percy for the organisation of the Council may be assumed to have been those of the official leaders. Nevertheless, when the ballot was taken, Lord R. Churchill was placed at the head of the poll by 346 votes; Mr. Forward, of Liverpool, who obtained the second place, only polling 298, whilst Earl Percy was eighth on the list with 260 votes.

Meanwhile meetings were being held in various parts of the country, at which Liberal and Conservative speakers urged, with unflagging zeal and presumably unconscious iteration, the same charges against their opponents. Lord Salisbury, at Sheffield, had quoted from a speech made by Mr. Bright at Bradford in 1859: "Repudiate without mercy any Bill of any Government, whatever its franchise, whatever its seeming concessions may be, if it does not redistribute the seats." And in spite of a curt denial of the applicability, and even of the correctness of the words employed, it was thought advisable to bring about a great Liberal gathering in the North to counteract the effect of Lord Salisbury in the Midlands. Accordingly Lord Hartington and Mr. Bright attended a large gathering in the Pomona Gardens at Manchester (July 26), and the former explained the objects for which that and similar meetings had been or would be called throughout the country.

"I take those objects to be," said Lord Hartington, "in the first place, to show the strong determination which animates all classes in this country, the enfranchised and the unenfranchised alike, to secure the enfranchisement of the householders in counties. Secondly, I take it that we are met together to express our confidence in the Government of Mr. Gladstone, and in the procedure which that Government proposes to adopt in order to carry into effect the object we have in view; and, thirdly, I take it that we intend to protest against the unprecedented and, as we consider, the unconstitutional action of the House of Lords, or a majority of the House of Lords, to dictate to the Government when and at what time a dissolution of Parliament shall take place."

Mr. Bright, after describing the persistent opposition of the House of Lords to previous Reform Bills, urged that it was the duty of those present to join with the rest of their countrymen in compelling a House representing directly nobody to accept a Bill which had been passed and granted by a House representing some millions. With regard to the quotation from his speech made in 1859, Mr. Bright declared that the advice then given referred to a Bill full of fancy franchises just introduced by Mr. Disraeli; and that in 1867 he had urged Mr. Disraeli to deal with the franchise and redistribution in separate Bills.

At a meeting of 1,000 representatives of the Conservative

Associations, held at the Cannon Street Hotel (July 28), Lord Salisbury and Sir S. Northcote were both present; and the former, after describing Mr. Bright's explanation as altogether unsatisfactory and disingenuous, went on to deal with Mr. Gladstone's plan of redistribution. As for the Premier's theory that parts of the kingdom distant from the metropolis needed more direct representation than those within easy reach, he pointed out that Cornwall, Wales, and Scotland, where this theory would be applied, were hotbeds of Liberal views, to the exclusion, especially of late years, of all Conservative opinion. He admitted that any claim on the part of the House of Lords to have the power of dissolving Parliament would not be justified by the Constitution, but they had a right to say they did not approve of any measure brought before them by the Commons, and that if the latter objected to its rejection their remedy was to go to the people. Mr. Bright, he said, tried to dispose of the House of Lords by saying it was a Tory caucus; but the truth was that until Mr. Gladstone became a leading figure and the leader of the Liberal party there was no talk of this paramount Tory majority in the House of Lords; and his belief was that if ever Mr. Gladstone should cease to be leader of the Liberal party there would no longer be that Tory majority in the House of Lords.'

To this demonstration the Liberals replied by a gathering of 2,000 delegates in St. James's Hall (July 30), on which occasion Mr. John Morley presided, and in the course of his speech declared that the Franchise Bill alone would not give the people half the power they would derive from a Franchise Bill supplemented by a good Redistribution Bill, but that as an instalment of their rights the Franchise Bill should be gratefully accepted. "Be sure," he added, in words which were to become party catchwords, "that no power on earth can separate henceforth the question of mending the House of Commons from the question of mending, or ending, the House of Lords."

Birmingham next bestirred itself to display its sympathies with the Ministry (August 4), and although the extent of the changes the speakers regarded as necessary may have seemed excessive to some members of the Cabinet, the support of the Birmingham Liberals was too valuable to allow minute criticism of its conditions. Mr. Bright, moreover, who declined the title of Radical and repudiated that of Democrat, delivered a homily on the misdeeds of the House of Peers since they had taken an active part in politics, but especially between 1760 and 1830. The Peers were "the results, —many of them the spawn of the plunder and the wars and the corruption of this dark ages of our country." For thirty years, —between the peace of 1815 and the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846,—"they raised their rents at a cost of periodic famine to hundreds of thousands of families; and now once more they are treating the House of Commons and the people with contempt and bitter insult." Mr. Bright saw no remedy more moderate than

the abolition of the Lords' veto, which he would make only a suspensive veto, so that they should not be allowed to reject again a measure twice passed by the Commons. This, he considered, would practically put an end to the veto altogether, except in the rarest cases, and would leave the debates of the House of Lords in the hands of genuine politicians. The non-political peers would enjoy their titles and county prestige, but would not come to Westminster for the fruitless purpose of defeating one year a measure which must pass in the year following. Mr. Chamberlain's speech was avowedly Radical, and consequently it jarred at times with the aspirations of his more "conservative" colleague, and he was not in the least degree conciliatory towards his opponents, or eager to accept their recent protestations. He did not think much, he said, of an affection for the franchise which had developed itself only after the death of the object of that affection. "The Tories hate the franchise. They will not extend it unless they can take away with one hand what they give with the other. We want redistribution to complete the franchise. The Tories want it to defeat it. . . . During the last one hundred years the House of Lords has never contributed one iota to popular liberties or popular freedom, or done anything to advance the common weal; and during that time it has protected every abuse and sheltered every privilege. It has denied justice and delayed reform. It is irresponsible without independence, obstinate without courage, arbitrary without judgment, and arrogant without knowledge."

A few days later (August 9) the Conservatives occupied at Manchester the hall and gardens where Lord Hartington and Mr. Bright had met the supporters of their party, and Lord Salisbury had as little reason to be dissatisfied with the reception he met with. The Conservative meeting, too, was as significant as the Liberal, for it showed Lord Salisbury and Lord R. Churchill on the same platform, and gave evidence of the latter's influence in Conservative politics. The indications of Lord Salisbury's readiness to adopt—at all events, for the nonce—the democratic Toryism of which his younger colleague had constituted himself the champion was shown in a hint thrown out that the Conservatives would not be indisposed to look with favour on equal electoral districts, or at least on some plan of representation based upon population. With this in his mind Lord Salisbury urged the electors of Lancashire not to rest until they obtained sixty-three members in place of the existing thirty-three, and the electors of Middlesex fifty-four in the place of sixteen. He called upon the Government to follow the example of Lord Grey in 1832, when beaten by the Lords, and to resign, promising that, unlike the Conservatives of that day, they would take office and complete the work which the Liberals were unable to carry through.

The prorogation of Parliament occurred a few days later, and the subsequent events of the campaign will be found recorded in the history of the recess.

CHAPTER V.

Russia and Central Asia—Fenianism in London—Transvaal Affairs—The Vacancy at Leicester—The Merchant Shipping Bill—Army Estimates, Navy Estimates, and the State of the Navy—The Cattle Plague Bill—Bills for the Enfranchisement of Copyholds and Leaseholds—For the removal of Bishops from the House of Lords—Local Taxation—Government of London Bill—Death of the Duke of Albany—Lord Randolph Churchill and the Opposition Leaders—The Budget—Gold Coinage Bill—National Debt Conversion Bill—The Irish Land Act—Lord Rosebery's Motion to Reform the House of Lords—The Estimates in Committee—The Prorogation.

OUTSIDE the two great topics of the year—the Franchise Bill and the Egyptian question—the policy of the Government gave rise to frequent, though rarely to sustained criticism. The majority of these questions naturally took their rise in one or other House, and for the most part public interest in them closed with the session. Without touching, therefore, upon the more important subjects of debate, which have been referred to separately, it is proposed to summarise in the present chapter the Parliamentary history of the session.

The news that the Turcomans living round the oasis of Merv had sent messengers to the Czar to request him to take them under his rule would probably have excited greater anxiety and interest had not the growing difficulties of our Egyptian policy absorbed general attention. It cannot, of course, be known whether this step was a spontaneous one on the part of Turcoman chieftains who had returned to their own country impressed by what they had seen at the Moscow coronation—or whether intestine feuds had so weakened the one-time dominant party, as to induce them to appeal to Russia for help; but whatever the cause may have been, the result was, that in spite of all engagements to the contrary, Russia had made an advance towards our Indian frontier, and had wilfully revived the feelings of distrust in her good faith which it had been one of Mr. Gladstone's aims to dissipate. Already in the report on the Address (February 22) Mr. Stanhope and Lord George Hamilton had cautiously alluded to the subject, and had received from Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice the assurance that the importance of the subject was fully felt by the Government, and that certain views were being pressed at St. Petersburg. Sir Charles Dilke further stated that the attitude of the Ameer of Afghanistan towards this country was most friendly, confident in the guarantee of the Indian Government to protect him from foreign aggression. Some days later (March 10) Lord Lytton resumed the subject in a lengthy review of our Indian policy, insisting strongly upon the folly of looking for a free, independent, and strong nation in Afghanistan. He contended that Russia, having assumed the position she now held in Merv, must interfere with and exercise an influence on

affairs in Afghanistan. He alluded, in passing, to the repeated assertions made by Russia as evidence of the uselessness of diplomatic assurances when they ran counter to national interests or national feeling; but the error of Her Majesty's Government was in having renounced in 1880, and reversed in 1881, the policy previously acted on by England in this matter. In abandoning Candahar they had given up a military position which would have enabled us to prevent a Russian advance through Afghanistan.

The Duke of Argyll admitted that the reception by Russia of the submission of the Merv tribes could only be interpreted as the annexation of that district, but he held that the British Government was in no sense responsible for the act. As to the engagements Russia had given in reference to Merv, she had not been guilty of any absolute violation of them or of any breach of faith. All her promises on the subject had been so carefully guarded that such a charge could not be established against her. He regretted that successive Cabinets had asked Russia for those assurances, and, without indicating what their policy ought to be, he hoped Her Majesty's Government would not ask Russia for any further assurances. He thought our recent successes in Egypt would have a good effect in India, and he believed that we could contribute to make Afghanistan a strong native State. In any event, our Indian frontier must be secured, and in any measure necessary for that purpose the Government would have the unanimous support of the country.

Lord Cranbrook thought that the important point to keep in view was the effect which the advance of Russia would produce upon the people of India, giving them the idea that Russia was an advancing and England a retreating power. If Afghanistan was to be protected, England must take steps to prevent the frontier tribes from invading Russian territory, and thus deprive that Government of an excuse for invasion. An independent Afghanistan he held to be an impossibility, and more than ever so under a ruler like the present, who was wholly powerless. He believed that no reliance was to be placed on Russian promises, because Russia might at any moment be pushed on by forces over which she had no control. The only hope of peace was in making her understand that if she advanced beyond a certain point she would bring herself face to face with the whole force of England.

In this opinion, Lord Kimberley, speaking on behalf of the Government, concurred. He never had placed too much reliance on the assurances received from Russia. He said that without any disrespect to Russia, but because of the circumstances of the case. At the same time, he could not go the length that the Duke of Argyll did in this matter, because he thought one friendly Government had a right to ask another for assurances in matters concerning their respective interests. He defended the policy of

Her Majesty's Government in respect of Candahar, and, with reference to the future, stated that while having full reliance on the ability of this country to maintain its possessions in India, Her Majesty's Government were in communication with the Government of Russia on the subject of fixing a boundary line, not only for the North-Western Provinces, but for all that portion of our Indian possessions which might be approached by Russia.

Lord Northbrook went a step further than his colleague in the Cabinet, declaring as his belief that the authority of Russia in Merv would not give Russia any greater influence in Afghanistan than she had gained when she advanced to Bokhara, but he regretted that authority because he thought it was likely to cause difficulties between Russia and Afghanistan, arising out of differences between the Turcomans of Merv and those of Afghanistan. The noble lord entered at considerable length on a retrospective history of the Afghanistan question, and a vindication of Lord Ripon from the charges against him involved in the observations of Lord Lytton. He ridiculed the idea that the possession of Merv by Russia could menace the British possessions in India, while he admitted that inconveniences might arise from Russian interference in Afghanistan.

After a sharp encounter between Lord Salisbury and Lord Granville on the subject of the Afghan wars of the previous Government, the subject was allowed to drop; and even the slight interest which had been momentarily excited in the public mind died away with the reappearance of a danger nearer home.

On February 26 a plot was arranged to blow up four of the principal railway stations of the metropolis—Victoria, Paddington, Charing Cross, and Ludgate Hill. In each case the same method was adopted. A quantity of "atlas" dynamite of American manufacture was concealed in a portmanteau, with an American clock so arranged that at a certain hour it would let fall a detonator and explode the charge. The portmanteau was then deposited in the cloak-room, the bearer having full time to escape. The machinery, which was of necessity complicated, seems to have been disarranged in all cases but one—but at the Victoria Station, shortly after midnight, a terrific explosion took place, shattering the luggage-room and a waiting-room, seriously injuring the booking office, and very nearly causing a fire by the bursting of a gaspipe. Luckily there were no passengers about the station, whilst by the presence of mind of the company's officials the fire was promptly extinguished. A careful examination of the cloak-rooms of the other termini was at once made, and similar packages left at Paddington and Charing Cross were discovered, in both of which the clocks had been set so as to ensure a simultaneous explosion. At Ludgate Hill the discovery was not made until some days later, but its connection with the plot was proved by the fact that in the package deposited were found the back of the clock used in the Paddington plot and the

labels torn off numerous packages of dynamite destined for use there and elsewhere. The Government at once offered a reward of 1,000*l.*, to which the railway companies added a like sum, for information as to the authors of the plot, but nothing transpired which led to any arrest. The only information which the police were able to obtain, so far as was communicated to the public, was that, February 20, about half-an-hour after the time at which the express from Liverpool was due at Euston, a hansom cab drove up to the Waverley Hotel in Great Portland Street. A middle-aged man (about forty) alighted there, whose luggage consisted of a portmanteau of black American leather. He hired a bedroom, and gave orders for his portmanteau to be carried upstairs, cautioning the "boots" to be careful, as it was very heavy. The stranger spent the greater part of the next few days there, seldom entering the coffee-room. On February 23 another stranger arrived, apparently an acquaintance of the first, and also took lodgings. The new comer's luggage consisted of a portmanteau similar in appearance to that described above, and two bags of slighter make, but also of black American leather. The two following days the two men were together all day. Between six and seven on the evening of the 25th the second comer sent for a hansom, and left with his luggage, having in his possession, in addition to the portmanteau he had brought with him, one of the black bags brought by his friend. The latter went a few minutes later, also in a hansom, taking with him his portmanteau and the remaining black bag. The man who drove away first was assumed to be the person who deposited the infernal machines in the cloak-rooms at Victoria and Paddington, his coadjutor being the depositor of the bag at Ludgate Hill, and also at Charing Cross terminus. The landlord identified the portmanteau left at Charing Cross station as the one taken away from the Waverley Hotel by this man. At the house there was also found a portion of the inside of the bag left at Paddington station, and which had been torn from it.

It was mooted whether an appeal might not be made in an informal manner to the Government of Washington to interfere to prevent the frequent recurrence of outrages presumed, in fair evidence, to have been planned in the United States. It was, however, at once seen that the difficulties in the way of more than friendly representation were insuperable, and the matter dropped. It was, moreover, an open secret that the United States Government had for a long time previously kept the British authorities informed of all facts connected with the Fenian societies which in any way bore upon these outrages. If, therefore, the English police were unwilling or unable to arrest on suspicion persons indicated to them by the New York authorities, it was scarcely likely that the latter would stretch their state or municipal laws in order to restrain American citizens who had been guilty of no overt act of felony in their own country. No immediate arrests followed on the discovery of these plots, but about six weeks later

(April 11) a man named Fitzgerald was apprehended in the neighbourhood of Whitehall and dispatched with the utmost secrecy to Sligo, for examination by the magistrates there in connection with a murder at Tubbercurry. On the following day (Good Friday) a man named Daly was arrested at Birkenhead railway station. He had been mixed up with the Fenian outbreak of 1867, and his movements, as he travelled to and fro between Liverpool and New York, had for some time previously been watched by the police. When arrested he was found to have in his possession two bottles of explosive substance, and no less than five infernal machines. Almost simultaneously a man named Egan, residing in the outskirts of Birmingham, in whose house Daly had been a lodger, was also arrested. A large amount of compromising correspondence was seized in the house, and in the adjoining garden explosives were found to have been buried. Amongst the letters written by Egan were found some announcing that on February 25 (the day of the explosion at the Victoria Station) Ireland would be avenged, and that suggested some close connection with the conspiracy, and Daly moreover was identified as having taken part in the Tubbercurry murder plot, and was known as a leading spirit among the Fenians. These facts were brought on when the prisoners were tried for treason-felony at the Warwick Assizes (August 1), and having been found guilty, Daly was sentenced to penal servitude for life, Egan for twenty years, and McDonnell, against whom no recent act of treason was proved, was ordered to come up for judgment when required.

After much discussion and a long stay in this country, the Transvaal Deputies had a final interview (February 27) with the Secretary of State for the Colonies (Lord Derby), and signed the new Convention. The principal points which, subject to subsequent ratification by the Volksraad, this treaty recognised may be thus summarised:—Suzerainty of England over the Transvaal abolished, England only reserving the right of veto on treaties with foreign Powers, except with the Free State and the northern Caffir tribes; the debt reduced by 131,000*l.* to 250,000*l.*; the western frontier amended, excluding Mankoroane and Montsioa, and including Moshette and Massowe, with extended territory of 20 by 130 miles. The delegates submitted to that line under the following conditions: First, that the Transvaal Government should take no part in the demarcation if made by force of arms; second, that the chiefs Massowe and Moshette should retain their *de facto* rights to land outside the line; third, that the Transvaal Government should not be responsible for the difficulties arising from excluding part of the subjects of Massowe and Moshette outside the Transvaal.

A week later (March 6) Sir Hercules Robinson returned to the Cape to resume his duties as Lord High Commissioner. His view of the policy adopted by the Government, in great measure at his own instigation, was explained by himself in a speech at a dinner

given in his honour on the eve of his departure. According to Sir H. Robinson's view the Convention established a uniform system of frontier policy along the fringe of all the British settlements in South Africa, thus minimising the friction of the white race on the black. A native department with a permanent native secretary and accountant would be established as an adjunct to the High Commissionership, and through this department the Commissioner would watch over the frontiers from the Orange River to the Limpopo, establishing police where necessary, appointing wardens of the marches, or residents on the borders alike among the Bechuanas, Zulus, and Swazies. A simple and practical system of administration would be established when it was sought for by the natives and demanded by circumstances. By this means most causes of bloodshed might, it was hoped, be removed, and ultimately the peaceful solution of the whole native question opened up. "The question of frontier policy," said Sir H. Robinson, "remains the most difficult one with which we have still to deal. Heretofore, as regards border troubles, this country has alternated between doing nothing or fighting. The native territories bordering on the settled districts have generally been left severely alone until, by the inevitable clashing of European expansion and native reprisals, the position has become intolerable, when force has been employed, and the conquered country annexed to some colony. Now, it appears to me that it would be both cheaper and easier to regulate these natural movements in their earlier stages. The tribal government of the natives upon the borders of the settled districts becomes weak from its contact with a higher civilisation, and what is wanted is some simple and inexpensive form of territorial government which will provide for the protection and political growth of the tribe, and for the cultivation of the unoccupied lands by Europeans, until the territory becomes ripe for absorption in the colonial system. Such a transitional scheme of government for border territories could only be carried out by the paramount Power; but I believe that it could be so carried out without imposing any permanent charge whatever upon the taxpayers of this country. I feel very sanguine that such a frontier policy, if gradually, cautiously, and intelligently developed, would pacify the country, relieve England from her present irritating responsibilities, and contribute an important factor to the advancement of commerce and the progress of our race."

In its most important features this policy was identical with the views urged by the Rev. John Mackenzie, who represented the chief Mankoroane during the deliberations on the frontier question, and who was appointed by the Government British Commissioner in Bechuanaland; and some days later (March 20) the Under-Secretary for the Colonies (Mr. E. Ashley) assured the House of Commons that a very wide discretion would be allowed to Sir H. Robinson and Mr. Mackenzie in dealing with that part of Stellaland left outside the new Transvaal frontier. After this the

greater part of the session was allowed to pass without any further reference to South African affairs in Parliament, but on the Vote for South Africa and St. Helena (July 30) Mr. Dawnay called attention to the state of Zululand, and condemned in strong but eloquent speech the action of the Colonial Office. He declared that the ghastly blunders of the Soudan were being repeated in South Africa, and furnished an unparalleled combination of bad faith, folly, and disastrous failure. Especially he blamed the disturbance of Lord Wolseley's settlement and the restoration of Cetywayo. Dealing with the future, he urged the Government to abandon the murderous policy of non-interference with the designs of the scoundrelly, filibustering Boers, which must end in the extirpation of the natives. The most efficacious policy, he maintained, would be an extension of the Reserve Territory, which could be effected at a cost of 6,000*l.* for the first year, and would not involve any cost afterwards. Sir H. Holland, who seconded the motion, went at length into the papers and into recent events in Zululand to prove that we could not get rid of our responsibility by merely protecting the Reserve Territory, but were bound to take measures to secure peace and order outside it. This, he thought, might be done on the lines of the settlement of 1879.

Mr. Ashley, speaking for the Colonial Office, maintained that the extension of the Reserve Territory meant virtually annexation, which the British Government had always declined. He defended the restoration of Cetywayo, which at the time was the only alternative to annexation, as a means of establishing a paramount power in Zululand, and there was at the time no reason to apprehend that it was predestined to failure. The papers would show that a considerable force of British troops was now present in the Reserve, and that everywhere steps had been taken to bring about a more peaceable state of things. Touching on Mr. Wodehouse's speech, he maintained that the future of the British name in South Africa depended more on the action of the British people individually than of the British Government. Our policy was to consolidate what we possessed rather than to extend our responsibilities indefinitely. On the whole, he asserted that the Government had done its best in dealing with the heritage bequeathed them in South Africa by their predecessors.

Lord R. Churchill, commenting on the Under-Secretary's speech, remarked that it confessed to another of the signal failures of Ministerial policy which were now becoming monotonous. The policy of the Government hereafter should be to study the interests of Natal and the natives of Zululand, and the Boers had no claim whatever on their consideration. All the difficulties of the situation, he maintained, arose, not from the Zulu war, but from the disgraceful and cowardly surrender to the Boers, of whom the Government evidently were afraid.

Mr. Forster expressed his misgivings as to the future policy of the Government, and warned them of the serious consequences of

attempting to evade the responsibilities which justice and expediency equally imposed on us.

Mr. Chamberlain defended the past dealings of the Government with Zululand, contending that when Cetuywayo was restored the country was not in a peaceful condition, and that the lines of policy recommended by Mr. Dawnay and Sir H. Holland must lead to annexation. Our responsibilities, he maintained, were fully discharged by the protection of the Reserve Territory, and we were not called upon to defend the natives outside the Reserve from the consequences of their own folly. He denied that the rule of the Boers over the natives was brutal and barbarous, and if they established a footing in Zululand he did not think it would be disadvantageous to the natives nor to the British rule in South Africa.

Sir S. Northcote complained of the meagreness of the Ministerial statements as to their future policy, and thought that the dissatisfaction and uneasiness manifested in the debate were perfectly natural. The policy of the Government in the past had confessedly not succeeded, nor had it a chance of succeeding, and the Government, by putting aside Lord Wolseley's settlement of 1879, had seriously increased their responsibility.

Mr. Gladstone replied that this settlement had been universally condemned after a short experience, and maintained that the condition of affairs was now much improved. For instance, the danger to Natal had been removed by the interposition of a neutral territory in the Reserve, where we were responsible for the preservation of peace and order. He repudiated annexation altogether, and disclaimed equally the establishment of political authority over the natives outside the Reserve, though he admitted the obligation to use our authority for the restoration of peace.

Mr. Dawnay's motion to reduce the Vote by 300*l.* was then negatived by 155 to 99. And although the explanations offered by the Ministry were generally looked upon as unsatisfactory, it was felt that the Opposition had no available policy to offer which could be regarded as preferable, and the matter was allowed to drop.

On the West Coast of Africa a further crop of troubles showed itself early in the year, and although every effort was made by the Ministry to minimise the difficulties of the situation, it soon transpired that the Colonial Office and Foreign Office, by means of persistent procrastination, had succeeded in placing this country in antagonistic relations with France, with Germany, with Portugal, and with the International Association. This last-named body, founded by the King of the Belgians with the view of opening up the Congo district to European commerce, had been almost immediately recognised by the United States as an independent Government. Acting apparently under the dignity thus conferred upon it, the Association at once began making a treaty with

Portugal. The International Association which had established itself on the Upper Congo naturally desired to facilitate the entry of goods at the mouth of the river ; although, so long as commerce was insignificant, native chiefs had been left free to make their own arrangements with traders, Portugal had always claimed the territory on the ground of being its first discoverer. She had, however, never exercised any act of sovereignty in those parts, and Great Britain had always refused to recognise her claim, although France and Holland were favourable to it. Under these circumstances, and in view of the action of the International Society, the Foreign Office determined to concede the claim of Portugal, embodying its conditions in a treaty. Under this the Portuguese territory inland was limited to a defined point, and no transit duties were to be levied on goods passing to the Upper Congo. Freedom for missionaries and equal treatment of all nationalities were bargained for, and engagements against the slave trade were solemnly renewed. By this means it seemed that France, which had acquired a small territory north of the Congo, might be kept out ; and this consideration Lord Granville might have thought would disarm the general dislike to a concession of the Portuguese claims, and to a treaty with a nation whose colonial habits were so repugnant to British feelings. But the event did not justify this anticipation. In reply to a motion by Lord Belmore (May 9) to print a petition against the Treaty, presented by the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, Lord Granville deprecated any discussion of the subject, on the ground that communications were going on between Her Majesty's Government and Portugal. Meanwhile he assured the House that the object of the Treaty was to promote trade, not to hamper any particular nation. It further transpired that France, by way of compensation or for some other cause, had come to a private understanding with the International Association, under which, should the latter be driven by any reason to abandon its work, France was to have the first refusal of its possessions. An arrangement of this character was hardly likely to meet the views of Prince Bismarck, at that time deeply interested in the establishment of German colonies on the West Coast of Africa. The House was therefore not surprised to learn (June 26) from Lord E. Fitzmaurice that, owing to the opposition of the Powers, the Congo Treaty would not be ratified.

The retirement of Mr. P. A. Taylor from the representation of Leicester led to some interesting disclosures as to the feelings of certain prominent men to whom the electors of that ultra-radical constituency made overtures. Mr. G. J. Holyoake, a well-known controversialist of strong secularist opinions, in reply to the invitation addressed to him, declared distinctly that he would not take the Parliamentary oath, and refused to make use of the formula which, after much hesitation, Mr. Bradlaugh had shown his desire to pronounce. Mr. Herbert Spencer, occupying a place

amongst the foremost speculative philosophers of the time, deprecated the too-commonly-received opinion that Parliament continued to exercise much real influence upon public opinion, and expressed but small appreciation of the pedestal thus offered him to obtain a hearing. The Liberal Committee, nothing daunted, next turned to Mr. Frederic Harrison, one of the most eminent publicists of the day, strongly imbued with the teaching of Auguste Comte, and identified perhaps more than any other professional man with the struggle of the working men against employers. He frankly avowed his determination not to submit to the trammels and exigencies of party government, and asserted his preference to remain outside Parliamentary life if he could only enter it by sacrificing his own individual convictions. Quitting then the level of philosophers and enthusiasts, the Liberal delegates turned to Mr. Allanson Picton, who, as vice-chairman of the London School Board, had displayed considerable tact in dealing with delicate questions, without ever sacrificing his own opinions; and that gentleman was eventually returned unopposed, his only competitor, Mr. R. Chamberlain, brother to the President of the Board of Trade, having withdrawn.

The disfavour with which Mr. Chamberlain's Merchant Shipping Bill had been received in many quarters emboldened his opponents to attack him upon the use he had made of his Bankruptcy Act of the preceding session. There had been, before Parliament met, repeated assertions that, in distributing the offices created by the Act, more regard was paid to the political bias and influence of the applicant than to his professional fitness. Mr. Dixon-Hartland lost little time in bringing the matter before the House of Commons. He declared (March 7) that out of sixty-seven Receivers in Bankruptcy fifty-one were Liberals of a more or less advanced type, and of these nineteen had been the election agents of their party. Mr. Chamberlain, although unprepared to refute in detail the various charges laid at his door, made a successful defence, asserting that in five cases only was he personally acquainted with the gentlemen appointed, of whom two he knew to be Liberals, and one a Conservative, whilst of the politics of the remaining two he was wholly ignorant. The other appointments were made by a departmental committee, whose selections, however, it was admitted by Liberal members, might not unreasonably be supposed to have been in consonance with the known sympathies of the President of the Board of Trade; whilst others, like Mr. Labouchere, openly declared that they saw no cause for reproach in the application of the maxim "the spoils to the victors." After a long debate the motion for a Committee of Inquiry was defeated by 101 against 53. And although a subsequent attempt was made by Mr. Chamberlain to reply more fully to the specific charges brought against him, the House showed more impatience at than interest in the explanations offered, for the President of the Board of Trade had by this time roused against him a far

more powerful class than even that from which the disappointed applicants drew their forces. The shipowners, not only of London but of the principal ports around the kingdom, were thoroughly roused, not only by the Merchant Shipping Bill introduced by Mr. Chamberlain, but by the manner in which the Minister was conducting the campaign against the shipowners. Meetings were held in London (March 3) and elsewhere, where the Bill was bitterly attacked. The speakers declared that they were as anxious as Mr. Chamberlain to minimise the dangers of loss of life at sea; but they maintained that this end would not be attained by the Bill before Parliament, whilst the Assurance Clauses, limiting the extent to which the owner might recover, would, it was loudly asserted on all sides, cripple the merchant marine, and render the position of shipowners far more desperate than it even then was. They demanded that at all events this part of the measure should be referred to a Select Committee, even though the Life Preservation Clauses were embodied in a separate Bill for reference to a Grand Committee. If the former plan were adopted, the shipowners declared that they would be able to meet Mr. Chamberlain's allegations, and to force him either to prove his own figures or to controvert theirs. To this Mr. Chamberlain replied that the time consumed in such an inquiry would shelve the subject for another session; and the need of some legislation was honestly admitted by both Conservatives and Liberals alike. The *Standard* hoped that the question—whether everything had been done to prevent loss of life at sea—was one to which the public had a right to have an explicit and immediate answer, regardless of any incidental quarrel which might have arisen between Mr. Chamberlain and the shipowners. On the need and constitution of Local Marine Courts there was a general agreement, whilst the proposals relating to procedure would furnish an admirable basis for some sort of arrangement. Those bearing upon the question of insurance undoubtedly offered the most debatable ground; but the *Standard* expressed the belief if an underwriter were allowed to plead over-valuation as a defence to the shipowner's claim, the substantial point which the Board of Trade had in view would have been gained. Sunderland and Portsmouth were almost the only seaports whence any display of popular feeling in support of the Bill was reported. On the other hand, the Newcastle Town Council passed a resolution in favour of its reference to a Select Committee; and the United Kingdom Steamship Assurance Association, doing an insurance business to the extent of 15,000,000*l.* sterling, declared that it was not able to name a single case where the loss of a vessel could be traced to the owner's greed for the insurance.

In order to meet, as far as possible, the views of the shipowners, Mr. Chamberlain proposed a conference between delegates of their body and certain Board of Trade officials, in order to agree upon the changes to be made in the Bill as originally drafted.

The proceedings were not formally reported, and it only transpired subsequently how greatly at variance were the views of the ship-owners and those of the Board of Trade. Mr. Chamberlain, nevertheless, attempted to proceed with his Bill, and eventually found an opportunity (May 19) of moving its second reading. In doing so he declared his belief that the increased loss of life at sea in recent years was chiefly owing to undermanning, overloading, and over-insurance, and the way to prevent this last-named practice was to make it impossible for the owner to reap a profit out of the loss of his ship. The principle of the Bill was to make the contract of insurance a contract of indemnity. Policies in excess of value would be void, and valued policies would be liable to be opened with two qualifications—that the excess was unreasonably above the true value, and that the application to open should come from 50 per cent. of the insurance value. The net freight, moreover, could only be recovered, and provisions would be made against double insurance. As regards the condition of insured ships sent to sea, unimpeachable contracts of seaworthiness would be required. The Employers' Liability Act would be extended to the mercantile marine for the protection of seamen, but exemption from its operation might be claimed where errors of navigation could be proved. Mr. Chamberlain made a concession to brokers and shippers by not extending the operations of his act to cargo, and by abolishing trial by jury in cases of marine insurance, which would be, however, tried in the Queen's Bench Division. The Bill, as sketched by the President of the Board, met with strenuous opposition from certain representatives of the shipping interest, led by Mr. MacIver; but it was supported by others, such as Mr. E. Smith, as well as by Conservatives, such as Mr. Gorst, and the debate on the second reading was adjourned, and never again resumed. The order for the discharge of the Bill was moved by Mr. Chamberlain (July 7), who gave as his reason the state of public business; but it was obvious that the hostility it had produced amongst a large section of the habitual supporters of the Government rendered it expedient to withdraw the measure at so critical a period. With his Railways Regulation Bill Mr. Chamberlain was even more unfortunate, inasmuch as he could not find an opportunity for explaining its scope. It was, however, formally brought in, and contained clauses for insuring punctuality, protecting passengers, and determining terminal rates; but in this case, as in that of the Merchant Shipping Bill, the President of the Board of Trade found himself far more bitterly attacked by those whose misused privileges he hoped to curtail, than supported by the classes whose interests he wished to serve.

It would be difficult to say whether the regrets of both Lord Hartington and Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, in having to explain the estimates of their respective departments at an hour when any practical discussion was impossible, were altogether without alloy. Precedence was as usual accorded to the army, and before making

his explanatory statement (March 17) Lord Hartington had to answer Sir George Campbell's proposal to make the lines of distinction between long and short service much stronger and clearer. For the purpose of our Indian and African armies short service was almost useless; whilst for the needs of home defence a large trained reserve was requisite. This proposal, if adopted, would virtually divide the army into two distinct services; and although Sir George Campbell was able to point to the experiment tried in the Foot Guards, of giving the recruits the option of serving with the colours for three years only or for a longer period, Lord Hartington admitted that the attempt had been only partially successful, and sufficient time had not elapsed to enable the authorities to judge what proportion of men would prolong their service until they had reached a high stage of proficiency. Lord Hartington, moreover, whilst expressing himself personally in favour of the principle, qualified his approval by a doubt as to whether it would be advantageous to maintain at home a large army which would never see foreign service. Sir Herbert Maxwell then opened a long discussion, chiefly sustained by the Scotch members, on the proposed discontinuance of the 'feathered bonnet,' worn through so many glorious campaigns by certain Scotch regiments. In the end Mr. Brand, on behalf of the War Office, promised that no immediate steps would be taken to abolish this coveted badge, although personally he sympathised very little with the supposed grievance. Earl Percy next intervened with a complaint that by rendering promotion to the rank of major dependent upon passing certain examinations many gallant and practically efficient officers might be stopped in their promotion, if they happened to be impervious to cramming, or unready in answering questions.

Mr. Tottenham touched upon a far more pressing matter when he urged upon the attention of the House the defective condition of the Army and the breakdown of our recruiting system. He went in minute detail into the statistics of recruiting, in regard to both the numbers enlisted and the quality of the recruits. For instance, of two regiments recently sent to the Mediterranean, 1,695 strong, 960 were of less than two years' service, 528 were under twenty years of age, and 190 had never fired a shot. In nine battalions there was a deficiency of 3,000 men below the establishment. The figures recently quoted by Lord Wolseley, he contended, were quite inaccurate, and in like manner he showed that the auxiliary forces were equally below their strength. The short service, he maintained, was a failure, we had been obliged to convert our second line of defence into our first line, neither being efficient, and no adequate remedy could be applied without a large increase in the number of our army. In reply, Lord Hartington, whilst admitting that many of our soldiers were still youths, contended that this was the necessary outcome of the short-service system, the operations in Egypt had shown that these young soldiers not wanting in steadiness. Until, therefore, it had been

proved that our present military system was inadequate for the defence of the Empire, he saw no reason for throwing a large expenditure upon the country. These views found little support on the Government side of the House, and were strongly criticised by the Opposition. No division, however, was taken on the resolution proposed by Mr. Tottenham, and shortly before midnight the Speaker left the chair, and Lord Hartington moved the Army estimates.

After explaining in detail the reductions and increases on the various votes, the Secretary for War dwelt at some length on the general condition of the army. He reminded the Committee that in the preceding year he was obliged to admit a considerable deficiency in the number of men, and a great difficulty in supplying the necessary drafts. The terms of service, however, had been made more elastic—a bounty had been offered to induce men to remain in India, and to prolong their term of service abroad, and the general result had attracted more than 33,000 recruits, the largest number ever known for a single year. The Guards were now only 100 below their establishment, the Infantry of the Line about 5,000 (the number being last year 8,700), and more than 1,000 men had been retained in India who would otherwise have returned home. There had also been a great reduction in the waste of the army, but as it was certain that a large number of recruits would be required in the coming year, the military authorities had their attention constantly fixed on the importance of taking every possible step for increasing the popularity of the service. The Militia had contributed 12,000 men and the Volunteers some 1,300. As to the quality of the men, he showed from the reports that there was nothing to complain of, and he again referred to the Soudan operations as a proof of the serviceable qualities of the young recruits. But, on the whole, the short-service system, he contended, gave us the means of filling even the weakest battalions with men in the prime of life and completely trained. Next he explained the details of the proposed increase of the establishments, and among these he mentioned that the battalions in Egypt would be increased to the full colonial strength of 800, and that the battalions at home which were to take their place as first on the roster for foreign service would be brought up to their full strength. The total increase of the infantry of the line, by these means, would be 2,400, and with regard to the artillery, he stated that four dépôts would be formed—three in England and one in Ireland. Turning next to our second line of defence, Lord Hartington declared that the total strength of the available reserves was 66,000. Of the militia, yeomanry, and volunteers, the reports were most favourable, and the actual force of the latter was 209,385, of whom 202,428 were efficient. After giving some particulars of the Medical Service and the Army Hospital Corps, Lord Hartington related at some length the progress of the Ordnance Department. With regard to the heavy

naval ordnance, three guns of 110 tons—the most powerful in the world—four of 63 tons, and three of 43 tons would be delivered in the course of the year, and the trials of the new 12-pounder breech-loading field guns were declared to have been of the most satisfactory character.

At the conclusion of Lord Hartington's speech, Col. Stanley, at 2 A.M., moved to report progress. This was resisted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the ground that the necessities of the service required an immediate vote; and after some discussion the motion was defeated by 120 to 70. Mr. Labouchere then moved to reduce the vote by 2,687 men, a proposal which led to protracted discussion and another attempt to adjourn a decision. Lord Hartington appealed to the House to consent to the proposed increase of the military force, which arose from the need of maintaining an army of occupation in Egypt; and ultimately Mr. Labouchere's motion was defeated by 162 to 31.

On the next Government night (March 20) the Navy Estimates were set down for discussion, but Mr. Campbell-Bannerman was even less lucky than his colleague at the War Office in finding an opportunity of explaining the general policy of the Admiralty; whilst, notwithstanding the vital necessity of maintaining our Navy in a high state of efficiency, asserted by statesmen and speakers of every shade of political opinion, the state of the House throughout the preliminary discussion and the Government statement suggested a very limited interest in the question. Lord Lewisham commenced the preliminary discussion of "grievances before Supply" by demanding an inquiry into the organisation of the Marines, on whom the brunt of so many recent campaigns had fallen. This demand for an inquiry into the administration of the corps by a Committee of Inquiry, or the alternative of a Royal Commission as suggested by Mr. W. H. Smith, was strongly opposed by Mr. Campbell-Bannerman on behalf of the Admiralty, and was ultimately rejected by 63 to 36, after a promise had been given that some inquiry into the system of appointment to the corps and the professional grievances of its officers should be instituted. In like manner the Admiralty absolutely refused to agree to Sir John Hay's motion for a committee to inquire into the condition of our iron-clad navy, which he declared to be wholly insufficient to protect the country and its commerce. At considerable length, and with obvious acquaintance with the facts of the case, Sir John Hay pointed out that, out of the 62 iron-clad ships figuring in the official list, 38 only were serviceable; whilst France with 29 serviceable iron-clads might at any moment join with Italy, which had 14 excellent ships of modern construction ready for service. Sir J. Hay went on to complain further of the backward condition of our naval artillery, declaring that even if the ships were ready there were no guns with which to arm them. Lord H. Lennox supported these views, and substantiated his charges at considerable detail; but Sir T.

Brassey maintained that there was no cause for alarm, and that the additions which the Admiralty were making to the fleet would be sufficient to maintain our naval supremacy. The Admiralty thus continued to hold the views as to the comparative strength of European navies which its secretary had expressed twelve-months previously. Mr. Gorst and Mr. T. Bruce warned the Government of the dangers of hesitancy in such critical times. Nevertheless Sir T. Brassey declared that it would be impossible for the Government to agree to such a committee, as it would, in fact, be a vote of censure on the Admiralty; and he went at length into particulars of the condition of the ships mentioned by Sir J. Hay to show that there was no ground for uneasiness. The present Board, he said, had done all in their power to strengthen the Navy, and if it was inferior to its requirements, it was on account of the condition in which they had received it from their predecessors. In answer to an appeal from Sir M. Hicks-Beach, Lord Hartington promised to take an early opportunity of stating what had been done in reference to colonial coaling stations; and at ten minutes to twelve the House went into Committee of Supply.

Mr. Campbell-Bannerman then made the usual statement on the Navy Estimates. The total amount he asked for the year was 10,841,770*l.*, apparently a decrease of 87,730*l.*, but, with the vote for Egypt, a real increase of 59,470*l.* After rendering a graceful tribute to the courage and endurance of the naval forces employed in Egypt, the Secretary to the Admiralty explained the steps which had been taken to improve the condition of the petty and warrant officers, involving an addition of 9,000*l.* With regard to the superior officers, he mentioned that an addition of 12*s.* per day would be granted to senior lieutenants of ten years' standing, and he announced also that the Admiralty was about to establish an Intelligence Department, consisting of the Senior Naval Lord, a special Naval officer, a Marine officer, and a gentleman serving in the Admiralty Office. Passing to the shipbuilding programme, he claimed that the Admiralty had built during the year 19,099 tons, of which 12,548 tons were of armour-clads, being within a few hundred tons of the estimate. Progress had been made with the "Admiral" class, the *Collingwood* was ready for a trial, and the *Impérieuse* and other vessels had been advanced. As to the coming year, a new ship, the *Hero*, was to be laid down at Chatham, which would be a second *Conqueror*, the *Colossus* was to be completed, three more *Merseys* were to be laid down in private yards, and a torpedo cruiser, the *Scout*, of 1,430 tons, with a speed of ten knots, was to be commenced. Several despatch boats were to be built, and designs had been prepared for a new Hecla, or torpedo depôt. In the aggregate it was intended to build 10,500 tons of armour-clads in the dockyards and 2,114 tons by contract, in addition to 5,500 tons of unarmoured ships at the dockyards and 2,510 tons in private yards. In concluding this portion of his subject, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman mentioned that

a small committee would be appointed to consider the questions of repairs and work in private yards. He touched lastly on the question of armament, and the principal point in this part of his speech was the announcement that a quick-firing 6-pound shell gun had been adopted, capable of firing ten aimed shots per minute, of considerable range and penetration.

On the Vote for Victuals and Clothing (May 8), Mr. W. H. Smith discussed at great length, and in the presence of less than a score of members, the shipbuilding programme of the Government, commenting upon the inordinate delay in completing ships which had marked the policy of the Admiralty. He further criticised the state of the Naval Reserve, and pointed out in what respects the accounts and returns furnished to the public were misleading. The Marine reliefs were more than ever inefficient in view of the constantly-increasing demand made upon their services. Sir E. Reed blamed Parliament for the lax supervision it exercised over the Admiralty, and fully endorsed Mr. Gorst's charge that the expenditure on the Navy was not regulated by the requirements of the Admiralty, or by the real needs of the country, but by the exigencies of the Treasury which refused to provide the necessary funds. Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, in replying to the charges brought with general unanimity against his department, took a very optimistic view of the condition of the Navy. The Admiralty had, in fact, been all along engaged in doing the very things which members from all parts of the House had accused it of leaving undone. He quoted numerous figures to show that all comparisons between our navy and that of France were fallacious, and concluded by assuring the Committee that the amount asked by the Admiralty was ample to maintain the Navy in a state of complete efficiency, and to uphold our naval supremacy against all rivals.

So far as the House of Commons was concerned the question of our naval armaments was allowed to rest in the comfortable position assigned to it by the Secretary to the Navy; but Lord Salisbury when at Plymouth (June 4) took the very fitting opportunity afforded of referring very pointedly to the matter. Taking as his principal theme the maintenance of the strength of the Navy, which had been discussed by previous speakers, Lord Salisbury expressed his regret that a Ministry was in office whose marked peculiarity was that they would not open their eyes to a danger until some disaster had happened. It would be too late, he said, to move votes of censure when they found the navies of other Powers were greater than our own. Alluding to the reports of strained relations between naval Powers at no great distance, he urged that the Government were bound to provide against the possibility of war, and that no consideration ought to allow any real doubt to rest upon our capability to resist any enemy that chance might bring against us.

The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord Northbrook) took the

first opportunity (June 9) after the reassembling of the House to defend the Board of Admiralty against Lord Salisbury's strictures. His argument, however, was chiefly based upon a mass of carefully arranged statistics, of which the object was to show that the Board of Admiralty, over which he (Lord Northbrook) presided, had done more to keep pace with French armaments than had the Ministry of which Lord Salisbury and Mr. W. H. Smith had formed part. The debate then descended to personal questions, in the heated discussion of which all further attempt to reach the truth of the statements made by scientific authorities was altogether lost sight of, and during the remainder of the session the question was not again seriously mooted, although a growing distrust in the optimist assurances of the official apologists of the Admiralty became more and more marked.

The second reading of the Bill of the Government—as altered by the Duke of Richmond and Gordon—to prevent the importation of foot-and-mouth disease into the United Kingdom, *i.e.* the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act Amendment Bill, was moved by Mr. Dodson in a morning sitting (March 18), with the explanation that the Government could not accept the duke's alteration of the Bill, more especially of the first clause, and that in Committee he must move to restore the Bill substantially to the form in which it was first introduced in the House of Lords. Mr. Arnold, whose original intention had been to move the rejection of the garbled Bill, pointed out that since the preceding July the number of places infected with foot-and-mouth disease had fallen from 307 to 166, and that the number of animals affected had fallen from 10,939 to 2,742; and he argued, therefore, that there was no excuse for strengthening the legislation under which the epidemic had already declined so notably. The most remarkable speech, however, was Sir Lyon Playfair's, who maintained that without the most stringent measure for stamping out disease within the country it was useless to take such precautions against introducing it into the country. "With regard to the statement that the disease which broke out in 1880 came from Deptford, there was no proof that that was the case; it appeared in Kent, Middlesex, and Bedfordshire simultaneously, and spread all over the country. Experiments had been made at the Brown Institution, by inoculating English cattle with the worst virus taken from diseased foreign animals at Deptford, and in every case they resisted it. The same animals, however, immediately took the same disease from English cattle." In other words, Sir Lyon Playfair expressed his belief that an English form of the disease had been acclimatised in this country, which was much more infectious to English cattle than the form in which it appears in foreign countries. He added further that in his opinion the disease took an epizootic form every four years.

Mr. Chaplin, after declaring that the farmers required protection from infection, quoted statistics which showed that in 1868,

when the number of live cattle and sheep imported into London was very much less than in 1867, the price of meat was very much less; and upon this statement he based his argument that the deficiency had been made good by an increased home supply. This was the very opposite opinion to that held by Mr. W. E. Forster, who had gone so far as to assert that the Duke of Richmond's amendment meant a total prohibition of free import, which would deprive the metropolis alone of 250,000,000 pounds of eatable food, or $32\frac{1}{2}$ pounds per head of the population. The Irish members expressed their fear lest their country should be treated as a foreign country, and demanded some assurance to the contrary; but Sir M. Hicks-Beach pointed out to Mr. Kenny that the Bill included the whole of Great Britain and Ireland, and was directed against the importation of cattle from foreign countries. The Bill as originally introduced, he warned the Government, would not satisfy the agricultural interest, and the returns, he contended, showed that a limitation on the importation of foreign cattle had not raised the price of meat, and that adequate protection against the disease was the most certain mode of securing a supply of cheap meat. Without adequate protection against the importation of disease it was impossible to expect the farmers to submit to oppressive domestic regulations, and he contended that, instead of locking the stable-door when the steed was stolen, as Lord Carlingford proposed, the wise course was to throw on foreign countries the responsibility of showing that they were free from disease.

Two entire mornings were consumed in these discussions, but ultimately (March 21) the Bill was read a second time without a division, both parties recognising that the real trial of strength would come at a later stage.

No opportunity for further discussion could be found before Easter; but as soon as the House reassembled, Mr. Dodson attempted to persuade the House to relax the rigidity of the Duke of Richmond's clause, and to restore the discretionary powers of the Privy Council in forbidding the importation of cattle from suspected districts. Although the borough members, irrespective of party, fairly supported Mr. Dodson (April 22), the county members, Liberal as well as Conservative, united against him, and with the support of the Irish members defeated the Government by 185 to 161. Further discussion was thereupon suspended, Mr. Dodson asking for time to consider what should be done; and a few days later (April 28) he offered as a compromise the proposal that the Privy Council should be compelled to prohibit importation "whenever they are not satisfied in respect to any foreign country, or any specified part thereof, that the sanitary arrangements afford reasonable security against infection." This offer was accepted by the Conservative and Liberal landowners, but was bitterly opposed by Mr. Broadhurst, on the ground that the landlords were ready to restrict the food of the people, in the hope of

being able to obtain their back-rents. He declared, moreover, that the tenant farmers, about whose interests so much had been said, would not benefit by the Bill; but that all the profits would go into the pockets of the rent receivers. Only forty-eight extreme Radicals were found to support these views, whilst 357 of all parties voted in favour of the compromise; and the Bill in its amended form was, after further opposition from Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Slagg, and Mr. W. James, read a third time by 124 to 21, and passed (May 3). The Lords, to whom the Bill was then referred back, accepted the Commons' amendments without demur (May 15), and the Bill thereupon (May 19) received Royal Assent and became law. A supplementary Bill, to enable local authorities to transfer the whole or part of their districts for the purposes of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1878, to the districts of neighbouring local authorities, was brought in by Mr. Hastings (June 18), and, with a few verbal amendments, passed (July 21), and received Royal Assent on the closing day of the session.

Amongst the attempts at Private Bill legislation may be mentioned the Water Bill of the Corporation of London, which was rejected (March 11) by 197 to 152, on the ground that its authors had not taken sufficient account of the statutory rights of the water companies. On the other hand the Bill for making a tunnel under Hyde Park and St. James's Park was read a second time by 124 to 64, but with the proviso that it should be referred to a "hybrid" Committee, composed of members of both Houses, by whom it was summarily rejected.

Mr. Waugh's Bill for the enfranchisement of copyholds passed, by 123 to 41, its second reading (March 12), in spite of the powerful arguments of Mr. Elton, the newly-elected member for East Somerset, who, in a maiden speech which drew from Sir William Harcourt a well-deserved compliment, retraced the history of copyhold tenure, and explained the part it had played in the history of England. Although the barren honour of a second reading was denied to Mr. Broadhurst's Bill for the enfranchisement of leaseholds, numerous supporters on different sides of the House bore witness to the growth of the conviction held by certain Tories that by an appeal to the democracy the advancing tide of Radicalism could be best stemmed. In Mr. Broadhurst's Bill the hopes of the Socialist party, as well as their hatred or fear of town landlords, were expressed with almost cynical frankness. According to his measure, every leaseholder occupying a house for an unexpired term of more than twenty years would be entitled to purchase, at a price to be fixed by the county court, its freehold in spite of the opposition of the owner. The price of the reversion was to be that which the property would realise in the open market, without any compensation for forced sale. By this means Mr. Broadhurst, who had commenced life as a working mason, hoped to baffle the "jerry-builder" from whose malpractices the poor had so much to suffer. Mr. Broadhurst, moreover, proposed to prohibit all future

leases for building purposes except under restrictions which, as the Attorney-General afterwards pointed out, would practically destroy the building trade for a generation, and hamper for all time those who attempted to provide for the ever-increasing needs of town population. The strongest support of the Bill came from Conservatives like Lord Randolph Churchill, who denounced the accumulation of land in a few hands; whilst it was opposed by the Attorney-General and the whole body of the Whigs and the county Conservatives, led by Colonel Dawnay, who "utterly repudiated" Lord R. Churchill's "monstrous doctrine," and ultimately the Bill was rejected by 168 to 104.

A scarcely less interesting debate was that raised by Mr. Willis's motion affirming that the presence of bishops in the House of Lords was a hindrance to the discharge of their spiritual functions and prejudicial to the commonwealth, and fit to be taken away by Bill. Mr. Willis explained that it was neither his intention to hold up the bishops to ridicule, nor to cast any discredit on their office, nor to improve the efficiency of the House of Lords, but as a step towards procuring the freedom of the Episcopacy from State control. He wished to see the bishops no longer the nominees of the Minister of the day, but the elected of the clergy, or of the clergy and laity together. The present state of the Church, he contended, was a scandal and an offence to the nation. In the Church none governed and none obeyed; the bishops were estranged from their clergy, and, so far as regarded their truly ministerial and spiritual influence, were well nigh extinct. Sir Wm. Harcourt, on the part of the Government, opposed the motion, and in the course of a long and powerful speech argued that it would be a mistake to suppose that to release the bishops from Parliamentary control would advance the cause of the Reformation. Those who wanted to get rid of the bishops in reality wished to get rid of the Church. To the protests which this assertion called forth the Home Secretary replied that if that were not so the position of those who supported the motion was untenable, but that if they regarded the bishops as a powerful outwork of the Church, the position assumed by the movers of the resolution was logical and worthy of argument. "Behind this motion and this discussion," continued Sir Wm. Harcourt, "there remain two great questions: the question of the Established Church and the existence of the House of Lords," and as these issues had not been openly raised, he hoped that the House would reject the motion before it. After a prolonged discussion, in which no representative of any Church party supported the resolution, it was rejected by 148 to 137, the minority being composed of the Radicals, English and Welsh Dissenters, the Scotch Presbyterians, and several Irish Home Rulers. Although the tellers for the majority were the Government whips, only two official members of the Liberal party (Lord Hartington and Sir F. Herschell) supported Sir Wm. Harcourt, and with them about half-a-dozen other liberals.

Conceived in a different spirit, but having indirectly a similar aim in view, was Mr. Leatham's Bill for amending the law with regard to the sale of Church patronage. In moving its second reading (June 18) Mr. Leatham explained that its object was to put a stop to the traffic in next presentation to benefices, and to prohibit altogether, under certain restrictions, the sale of advowsons. The Bill, moreover, vesting the patronage in the Crown would empower the Queen Anne's Bounty Commission to purchase livings at half the market value and to recoup themselves by a charge on the living after the next avoidance. An amendment was moved by Mr. Albert Grey postponing all reform of the law of Church patronage until the parishioners were allowed a right to veto any clergyman whom they might think unsuitable; but this idea met with small support, and the amendment having been negatived by 141 to 83, the Home Secretary (Sir Wm. Harcourt) having admitted that the sale of livings for money was a grievous scandal. The Bill was then read a second time without a division, and upon the motion of Mr. Stanhope was referred to a Select Committee. Time, however, was wanting to bring the labours of the Committee to a conclusion, and a few resolutions were agreed to (July 24), which were communicated to the House of Lords (August 5) in reply to a message from that body.

Another attempt, equally abortive, at private legislation was Lord Thurlow's motion (March 21) for opening the Museums on Sunday. The discussion which was provoked showed, as usual, great diversity of opinion; and was by turns supported and opposed from each side of the House without regard to party views. The Opposition was led by the Earl of Shaftesbury, who, as in the previous year, desired to substitute week-day evenings for Sunday afternoons, as more in accordance with the wants and wishes of the working classes. Lord Carlingford, although deprecating the idea that he was speaking on behalf of the Government, kept prominently before the House the fact that in his official character (Lord President of the Council) he had special opportunities for gauging the advantages and drawbacks of Lord Thurlow's proposal; and whilst unwilling to go in advance of public opinion, declared that he would welcome with pleasure the day when he could make Sunday more valuable to large classes of his fellow-countrymen by opening the public museums and galleries. The Archbishop of Canterbury strongly opposed this view, and urged that among the working-men themselves there was a large majority opposed to any such step. In this view he was supported by the Bishop of Oxford. The motion was at length rejected by 46 to 38; ten spiritual peers voting in the majority, and thus determining the question.

The annual motion in favour of legalising marriage with a deceased wife's sister was this year made in the House of Commons by Mr. Broadhurst, who moved (May 6) a resolution to that effect. The most noteworthy speech was from Mr. E. Clarke,

a Conservative and Churchman, who held it to be most mischievous to refuse to repeal the law. Mr. Broadhurst's resolution was carried by 238 to 127, thirteen Conservatives voting with him, whilst Mr. Gladstone left the House before the division. The Bill, however, introduced in the House of Lords by Lord Houghton (July 7) to give effect to this resolution was abandoned (July 10) without an effort to save it from the general wreck.

Two other questions having an ecclesiastical bearing were brought before the House of Commons,—Mr. Richards' Bill to abolish the obligation of Cemetery Boards to divide cemeteries into consecrated and unconsecrated ground, and Dr. Cameron's Bill for legalising the practice of cremation. In explaining the former Bill (June 25), Mr. Richards pointed out that under it the bishop would be no longer called upon to consecrate the ground, and future incumbents would have no right to burial fees. Mr. Beresford Hope's motion to read the Bill a second time that day three months was negatived by 176 to 154, but it being then a quarter to six (Wednesday), the debate stood adjourned, and no opportunity for its renewal occurred. Dr. Cameron urged (April 30) his improvement in that method of disposing of the dead on strictly sanitary grounds, but it was opposed by both the Home Secretary and his predecessor in office (Sir R. A. Cross), and was ultimately rejected by 149 to 79.

Following up the advantage gained by Mr. Chaplin in the previous session, Mr. Pell brought forward (March 28) a resolution deprecating any further postponement of the promised measures for the relief of local taxation. The Government, whilst admitting the grievance complained of, and acknowledging that the local ratepayer bore an undue share of local taxation, because it fell upon one kind of property, declared that until the whole system of local administration was reorganised it would be impolitic to deal with one side only of the question. When the Franchise Bill and the Government of London Bill had been disposed of, the Government would at once lay before the House the County Government Bill. Mr. Pell declined to be put off with a vague promise contingent upon the realisation of an almost impossible programme. He pointed out that, inasmuch as the Imperial taxes are levied upon all sorts of property alike, it was quite easy to increase the State Contributions to local purposes without reference to any ulterior proposals of reform or local self-government. In spite of a strong resistance on the part of Sir Charles Dilke, the Government was defeated by 208 to 197, but the Opposition were forced for the remainder of the session to content themselves with this barren victory.

On the last night before the Easter holidays (April 8) Sir William Harcourt found an opportunity of explaining the Bill which the Government proposed for the government of London. This measure, which was to form the second great Bill of the session, was destined to receive but scant attention, and its in-

introduction into an almost deserted House might have been accepted as an omen of its subsequent neglected career, prematurely closed after one or two spasmodic efforts to give to it the appearance of a hopeful future and a robust constitution. In introducing his Bill, Sir William Harcourt explained at some length the reasons why the existing Corporation had not extended with the spread of the metropolis, and also why it had not been included in the Municipal Reform Act. Comparing the arguments for separate municipalities and a central body, he showed that the balance of authority largely preponderated in favour of the latter. The great evil at present was, as he contended, the multitude of independent authorities; but in deciding that there should be one central authority he did not propose that it should do everything, but that it should control the action of local bodies. Having answered the various objections to the creation of a central body, laying particular stress on the good work done by the Metropolitan Board of Works, and admitting that the extinction of the Corporation would be a shock to Parliament and the country, he stated that the Corporation of London would be taken as the basis of the central municipal body. The area would be that named in the Metropolis Local Management Act of 1855, and the inhabitants of that area would be incorporated as citizens into the existing Corporation. The qualification would be the same as in all other municipal boroughs, and all the satellite bodies of the present Corporation, such as the Commission of Sewers, the Wardmotes, &c., would be merged in the new Corporation. The existing powers of the Metropolitan Board would be transferred to the Corporation, as well as the powers of the vestries, the administrative powers of the justices of the metropolitan counties, the burial boards, &c. The property and the debt of these various bodies would also be transferred, but it was not proposed to meddle with the administration of the Poor Law, nor the Education Board, nor the administration of the police. The new Corporation would act exactly as all other councils for all purposes; the Common Hall would be abolished, and the metropolis, having been divided into municipal districts or wards corresponding with the existing areas under the Metropolis Management Act—thirty-nine in number, including the City—would elect 240 members, the number allotted to each area being in proportion to the population and the rateable value. The number, however, allotted to the City would be calculated on the rateable value alone, and would be thirty, while in the other areas the number would vary from twelve or fourteen to one. The Lord Mayor would be elected annually by this body, and there would be a Deputy Mayor; but as the magisterial functions of the aldermen would be transferred to a stipendiary, and their administrative functions to the Common Council, so that their peculiar features would disappear altogether, it was not proposed to create any more titular aldermen. Having stated that the election of the Common Council would be triennial, Sir

William Harcourt next explained the constitution of the local councils, analogous to the present vestries, which it was proposed to create in each area, which, he said, would be elected at the same time as the central councils, and would have charge of the minor functions of administration. They would not, however, have any independent authority, but would exercise a derivative authority delegated to them by the Common Council and defined by distinct orders emanating from it. The Common Councillors for each area would be members of the local council, and the check would be that work performed by the local councils would be paid for out of local rates, while that done by the Common Council would be charged on the local fund. Sir William Harcourt went on to describe the financial proposals of the Bill, which would leave to the Corporation all its property and make special provision for the maintenance of the hospitality of the City. The whole metropolitan area would be included in the county of the City of London, and in place of the present county sessions justice would be administered by the Recorder and Deputy-Recorders. The City county-courts would be continued, stipendiaries being appointed, and ample provision for securing the interests of existing officials. Finally, he described the arrangements to be made for the transition period, to prevent the chaos which might occur from too sudden a change. The first election of councillors would occur on Jan. 9, 1885, but only 150 councillors would be elected, the remaining ninety being furnished by transferring the forty-six members of the Metropolitan Board bodily, and forty-four members being elected by the existing Corporation of London. Until May 1, 1885, the council would only be provisional, but after that date it would come into complete possession of all its powers, and if the Bill passed the term of office of the present Lord Mayor would be extended for six months. Sir William Harcourt concluded by claiming for the Bill that it was a moderate and painstaking effort to amend admitted evils on the ancient lines. No discussion ensued, and the Bill was read a first time without opposition or remark.

Three months, however, had to elapse before the Home Secretary found an opportunity for submitting his proposals to general discussion. By the press and public his scheme had been received with lukewarm approbation, the Reformers accepting it only as an instalment of their demands and fancied rights, whilst the Obstructives threatened the most determined opposition to a measure which they characterised as one of spoliation. When at length the Franchise Bill was clear of the House, Sir Wm. Harcourt at once (July 3) moved the second reading of his Bill, although it presented scarcely fewer points of discussion than the Redistribution Bill, which was withheld for want of time for its debate. If the Home Secretary had ever nursed the hope that his Bills would be acceptable alike to Tories and Liberals, and that it held out sufficient bribes to disarm criticism, he was speedily

disabused. Mr. Ritchie, the member for the Tower Hamlets, at once moved an amendment declaring that the House would withhold its assent to any Bill which vested the control over the levying and expenditure in any one central body, to the practical extinction of local self-government and vestrydom. After two adjourned debates, in the course of which the divided opinions of the metropolitan members came out with great clearness, Mr. Gladstone endeavoured to limit the area of the discussion by explaining (July 8) that what the House had to decide was whether the time had arrived when Parliament ought to endeavour to establish one controlling municipality for the whole metropolis. An attempt to evade this point by the side issue of an adjournment was defeated by 188 to 117. Two days later the Bill was withdrawn from further consideration.

The sudden and unexpected death of the Duke of Albany at Cannes in a fit of apoplexy brought out in strong colours the depth and reality of that loyalty which forty years of the Queen's reign had rendered popular. The almost unbidden and wholly voluntary display of general mourning which showed itself in every class of society was evidence of the hold which the Royal Family had upon the national feeling. The deceased, better known as Prince Leopold, had from childhood been of delicate health. An inclination as well as necessity had led him to studious pursuits, taking full advantage of the opportunities offered to him in his University career. As he grew older and stronger he was able to give a wider scope to his tastes, and he soon showed himself an intelligent lover of the fine arts, cultivating fruitfully the hereditary aptitudes of his family for music and painting. But the bent of his mind was above all literary: his reading was extensive, his taste refined, and his sense critical. Living for the most part a retired life, he attracted round him perhaps few friends, but by these he was highly esteemed and greatly beloved. In both Houses of Parliament the addresses of condolence to the Queen and to the widowed Duchess reflected the high sense of the Prince's mental powers and moral worth left upon those who were brought in contact with him. Earl Granville, who perhaps knew him more intimately than any of the other speakers, said of him, "He studied letters, science, and art in different lines in imitation of his illustrious father and very much in the same spirit. He applied the results of these studies in persistent efforts to raise all classes, especially the lower classes, in this country to a higher level of enjoyment and of knowledge. It was only three years ago that his Royal Highness became a member of this House, and if he did not take a leading part in your lordships' discussions, it was exclusively owing to that judicious determination of the members of the present Royal Family that they should not be mixed up in political and party strife. In all other respects he was qualified to take a foremost part among your lordships—in voice, manner, culture, and the thought necessary for a first-rate speaker. He took great

interest in political questions, in home politics, in foreign politics, and especially in colonial politics. He gave frequent assistance to the Queen in Her Majesty's political work, and his own strong wish—I may say his concentrated ambition—was to be employed in the service of the State. I do not think it is here or now necessary for me to dwell upon the merits of his private life. Many of your lordships know too well his capacity for friendship, his affectionate feelings, and his simplicity and modesty of bearing, although associated with the consciousness of mental power."

In the House of Commons Mr. Gladstone, scarcely recovered from an illness which at one time threatened to deprive him for a lengthened period of the use of his voice, reappeared in order to bear his testimony to the loss sustained by the nation as well as by the Royal Family: "The Duke of Albany's gifts were indeed of no common order, and they had been carefully cultivated from his youth upwards by the assiduous care of his parents, and cultivated also latterly with yet greater effect by his own manly determination. He was a person in whose case it could not be said that the possession of a principedom was likely to be a barren and idle distinction. His whole idea of his position was in its association with public duty and with public service, and both the gifts which it pleased Providence to bestow upon him and the cultivation which was incessantly applied to them gave richest and most certain promise that if it had been happily permitted to us to have witnessed a prolonged career in his case, that career would have been marked in every point of its progress by acts as well as words which would have given him an honourable place in the history of his country. Sir, the Duke of Albany, both from his rich endowments, and likewise from the cultivation of those endowments, recalled in no small degree the memory of his illustrious father; and I think that those who have made themselves acquainted with the sentiments of the Duke of Albany upon the various occasions upon which he has appeared before portions of his fellow-countrymen for the purpose of putting forward some great public object will have been pleased to trace both in the general turn of mind and even in the forms of expression—in the whole shape and manner of proceeding—that the father was in a certain sense revived in the son."

On the eve of her departure for the Continent to be present at the marriage of her granddaughter (Princess Victoria of Hesse) the Queen addressed, through the Home Secretary, the following letter to her people:

Windsor Castle, April 14, 1884.

I have on several previous occasions given personal expression to my deep sense of the loving sympathy and loyalty of my subjects in all parts of my empire. I wish, therefore, in my present grievous bereavement, to thank them most warmly for the very gratifying manner in which they have shown not only their sympathy with me and my dear so deeply-afflicted daughter-in-law, and my other children, but also their high appreciation of my beloved

son's great qualities of head and heart, and of the loss he is to the country and to me.

The affectionate sympathy of my loyal people, which has never failed me in weal or woe, is very soothing to my heart.

Though much shaken and sorely afflicted by the many sorrows and trials which have fallen upon me during these past years, I will not lose courage, and with the help of Him who has never forsaken me will strive to labour on for the sake of my children, and for the good of the country I love so well, as long as I can.

My dear daughter-in-law, the Duchess of Albany, who bears her terrible misfortune with the most admirable, touching, and un murmuring resignation to the will of God, is also deeply gratified by the universal sympathy and kind feeling evinced towards her.

I would wish, in conclusion, to express my gratitude to all other countries for their sympathy—above all to the neighbouring one where my beloved son breathed his last, and for the great respect and kindness shown on that mournful occasion.

VICTORIA, R. and I.

To return to the turmoil of political life. Lord Randolph Churchill seized the opportunity offered by the Easter Vacation to push forward his candidature for Birmingham, which he wished to deliver from the reproach of being the "pocket borough of the Radical party." The reception he met with at the Town Hall, if it could be taken as the expression of one section of public opinion, was such as to encourage the leader of the Fourth Party in his bold adventure, for the audience he addressed was strongly sympathetic. The principal part of Lord R. Churchill's speech, however, after laying down that "Radicalism was all humbug," was the explanation he gave of his own personal views, and of the attitude of the regular Conservative party towards himself. Putting himself forward as the exponent of the wishes of a Tory democracy, he declared his independence of the official Conservatives of the first Opposition Bench. "I have no right, a humble member of the rank and file of the Tory party, to declare to a great meeting like this what will be its policy. I do not know what will be the policy of the Tory party. I am not the least bit in the confidence of the leaders, and though I have laboured hard and unremittingly—and, as your great kindness to me to-night proves, not altogether without success—I must admit that I do not enjoy the high honour of their friendship. Only the other night one of them accused me in the House of Commons of being in secret and fraudulent alliance with the Prime Minister for the destruction of the Tory party. I have not been able to gather from their speeches or their acts what would be the policy they would adopt if the responsibility for government was placed upon them. They have preserved a prudent—perhaps an over-prudent—reticence. Possibly Lord Salisbury will give us some enlightenment. This much I can safely say, I do not for a moment imagine that their Government would be more feeble or more unfortunate than the present. I hope and believe they would do much better. But though I cannot tell you what their policy will be, I think I can tell you what their policy ought to be, and I think I can tell you in general

terms what I will try to make it if ever I should represent this powerful constituency. It shall be a policy of honesty and courage. It shall be a policy which will grapple with difficulties and deal with them, and not avoid them or postpone them. It shall be a popular policy, and not a class policy. It shall be a policy of activity for the national welfare, combined with a zeal for the imperial security. In a word, gentlemen, it shall be a policy consistent with the best traditions and the highest aspirations of the ancient Tory party, and in no way unworthy of the approval of a great and free people." And on the following day, when delivering his presidential address to the Midland Conservative Club (Birmingham), Lord Randolph urged on his party the necessity of further attention to party organisation, the old methods being now obsolete. The Liberals having got ahead of them with their caucus, he saw nothing objectionable in that method of organisation, except that the Radicals had pushed it to a mischievous and tyrannical extreme. Speaking of what the policy of the Tory party should be, he said: Social reform, producing direct and immediate benefit to the masses, should be their cry, as opposed to the Radicals, who screamed for organic change. He had long tried to make as his motto the phrase used recently by Mr. Gladstone, "Trust the people." There were a few in the Conservative party who had still that lesson to learn, and who did not yet understand that the Tory party of to-day must no longer be dependent upon the small and narrow class identified with the ownership of land; but that its strength must be found and developed in our large towns as well as our country districts.

No little curiosity was felt as to the attitude which Lord Salisbury would assume towards so dangerous an ally as Lord R. Churchill was pronounced to be. An opportunity of expressing his opinion was afforded him at Manchester (April 16); but he said little or nothing which could be fairly interpreted as bearing upon the issue raised. In reply to an address of welcome from the Manchester Conservative Club he merely remarked that the integrity of the empire would be a touchstone by which the work of the statesmen of this generation would be judged by posterity. In spite of the language of Ministers, the probabilities pointed to an early appeal to the people, and upon the watchfulness which marked the Conservative organisations would depend the result of what would probably be one of the most critical dissolutions of English history.

The introduction of the Budget was from various causes delayed until a very much later date (April 24) than usual, but the firm conviction which prevailed in all quarters that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had no surprise in store checked any display of anxiety or undue curiosity. Mr. Childers' programme, at all events, did not falsify the predictions of the prophets. In a singularly simple and business-like speech, the delivery of which was delayed far beyond the ordinary hour, he explained the finan-

cial position of the country. The supplementary estimate, chiefly necessitated by the difficulties in Egypt, had swallowed up the large surplus which, although not anticipated when the Budget for 1883-4 had been explained, had, nevertheless, been accumulated. These supplementary estimates, amounting to 1,385,000*l.*, had swollen the expenditure of the year to 86,436,000*l.*, whilst the revenue, exclusive of the very shadowy profits of the Parcel Post, had reached 86,549,000*l.*, leaving only a bare surplus of 113,000*l.* Passing to details, Mr. Childers went into an elaborate review of the principal items of the Customs and Inland Revenue, showing that, in the aggregate, the Tax Revenue actually received amounted to 71,866,000*l.*, as against an estimate of 71,114,000*l.*, and an actual receipt in the previous year of 73,128,000*l.* The non-tax Revenue, which he analysed in a similar manner, being estimated to yield 15,435,000*l.*, actually produced 15,339,000*l.*, as against a yield in the previous year of 15,876,000*l.* The total revenue received in the year amounted to 87,205,000*l.*, being 656,000*l.* more than the estimate. Dealing with the expenditure in similar detail, under the various heads, he showed that the actual expenditure amounted to 86,999,000*l.*, as against an estimated expenditure (with supplementary estimates) of 87,819,000*l.*, so that the surplus of actual revenue over expenditure is 206,000*l.* Describing next the operations of the past year in the reduction of debt, he showed that the Funded Debt, which, at the end of March 1883, stood at 712,699,000*l.*, was on March 31, 1884, 640,631,000*l.*, showing a reduction of 72,068,000*l.* effected under the Act of last year. Meanwhile, the War debt incurred by the previous Government, and the share paid by this country to India on account of the Afghan War—upwards of eleven millions sterling—had been paid off out of the income year. The accounts, therefore, showed the following results:—

Receipts.		Expenditure.	
Tax Revenue—		Consolidated Fund, Charges	
Customs	£19,850,000	and Interest of Debt . .	£31,104,000
Excise	26,800,000	Army Votes	15,931,000
Stamps	11,490,000	Navy Votes	10,812,000
Land Tax	1,055,000	Afghan War (contribution)	250,000
House Duty	1,880,000	Civil Services	17,244,000
Income Tax	10,050,000	Customs and Inland	
Non-Tax Revenue—		Revenue	2,734,000
Post Office & Telegraphs	9,700,000	Post Office	4,752,000
Crown Lands	380,000	Telegraph Service	1,734,002
Miscellaneous	3,170,000	Patent Service	731,000
Interest on Advances .	1,180,000		
Total	£85,555,000	Total	£85,292,000

being an estimated surplus of 263,000*l.*

Dealing first with the expenditure, Mr. Childers expressed his regret that, although, in compliance with Mr. Rylands' motion of the previous session, he had been engaged in studying the growth of expenditure, he was not in a position to present any definite report. He admitted that in the ten years between Mr. Gladstone's

withdrawal from office to 1874, and the close of the financial year, 1883-4, the Civil Service estimates, after making all allowances, had increased from 16,442,000*l.* to 24,675,000*l.* Of this sum the greatest portion was due to increased local subventions, to the demands of public education, and to the improved postal and telegraph services. The revenue from these sources, on the other hand, had fallen short of anticipation, especially in the Parcel Post, so that it would be found necessary to postpone for twelve months the introduction of sixpenny telegrams.

With a surplus of scarcely more than a quarter of a million, it was obvious that any reduction of duty would be inexpedient if not altogether impossible. Beyond, therefore, the remission of certain carriage duties, entailing a loss of 22,000*l.*, Mr. Childers proposed to leave existing taxation untouched for the present, admitting that a revision of the "death duties" was pressing and desirable. Any settlement, however, on a new basis he thought should be left until the whole question of local taxation should come up for discussion. Any change in the probate or legacy duties, Mr. Childers thought, should embrace some addition to the revenue, and a heavier proportional charge on real estate, and on the land held in mortmain. When the time came for relieving local ratepayers, the local landowners would be found to be those who benefited the most, and consequently the settlement of the death duties might, he thought, be advantageously postponed until the whole question came up for settlement.

There were, however, involved in Mr. Childers' budget two very important proposals which, if adopted, would sooner or later produce a very sensible effect on the revenue. The deterioration of the gold coinage, apart from any suggestion of foul play, had of late become a serious question. As wealth and trade increased it became clear that whilst in larger transactions notes and cheques every year played a more important part, the gold in circulation changed hands more frequently, and was spread over nearly the entire surface of the globe. In the United Kingdom and its dependencies it was estimated that about ninety million sovereigns and about forty million half-sovereigns were in constant use; whilst of their total more than half (55 per cent.) were of light weight, and consequently were not strictly legal tender. Any attempt to withdraw this amount forcibly from circulation would inflict serious losses upon individuals, or still heavier upon the banks. In order, therefore, to guard against any recurrence of such a loss of confidence in the coinage as marked the reign of James II., Mr. Childers proposed to substitute for the existing half-sovereign (representing more or less accurately its nominal value) ten-shilling pieces, containing only nine shillings' worth of gold. The deficiency on the half-sovereigns in circulation (which, unlike the sovereign, are not an "international" coin) was estimated at 200,000*l.*, and on the sovereigns at 510,000*l.* If the plan for coining the new half-sovereign were accepted, Mr. Childers

anticipated that in twenty years the annual profit arising on their issue (about 250,000*l.* per annum) would create a fund, out of which the cost of the withdrawal of light gold might be met without entailing any loss upon either individuals or the State. The total profit upon the conversion of the whole number of half-sovereigns in circulation would be about two and a-half millions, and the cost thrown upon the mint about 1,170,000*l.*, leaving a balance of 1,330,000*l.*, which Mr. Childers estimated would suffice to keep the cold coinage of the future in a satisfactory condition. The Bill was formally read a first time (May 2), but, in the face of the opposition it aroused amongst bankers and others, it was withdrawn without discussion (July 10), with numerous other Government Bills.

The other proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was destined to meet with more approval. In the previous session an Act had been passed for converting a considerable portion of the permanent debt into terminable annuities, it having been understood at the time that on a portion at least of the remainder the rate of interest would be reduced. By the existing law both Consols and the Reduced Three per Cents. might be paid off by giving a year's notice, and the New Threes at any moment, but only in the lump sum. In view of the maintenance of Consols for so long a time above par, and the steady rise of the Two-and-a-half per Cents. from 86 to 91 in the two previous years, the Government judged the moment opportune to propose a voluntary conversion. The Chancellor of the Exchequer therefore offered to allow the existing holders of 612 million Three per Cents. to exchange them, at their option, either for Two-and-a-half per Cents. at the rate of 108 for 100, or for Two-and-three-quarter per Cents. at the rate of 102 for each 100 stock. As an additional inducement, the interest of the new stock was to be paid quarterly, and would not be redeemable under any circumstances before 1935. If the whole Three per Cent. stock were converted into Two-and-a-half per Cent. stock there would be a net saving of 1,310,000*l.* in the annual interest of the debt, after setting aside a sinking fund to pay off the nominal increase on the total amount of the debt. In the event of the conversion not being made voluntarily to any appreciable extent, Mr. Childers intimated (May 26) that the conversion would be compulsorily, though gradually, effected. Mr. Hubbard moved the rejection of the Bill, and found his view endorsed more or less entirely by Mr. Salt, Mr. Kennard, and others; whilst Mr. W. Fowler, Mr. Magniac, and Mr. R. B. Martin supported the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Mr. Goschen, in answer to the objection that under the scheme the capital of the National Debt would be increased, pointed out that this could only occur in the event of the Two-and-a-half per Cent. stock being paid off at par, that in any case the annual burden on the taxpayer would be reduced. The amendment was finally (June 6) negatived by 117 to 34, and the second reading agreed to. The Bill, however, was

subjected to very searching criticism in Committee (June 12 to 20), but it at length passed with a few verbal alterations, and became law (July 3).

At the very outset of the session Mr. Barry had given notice of his intention to amend the Irish Land Law Act, 1881, and shortly before Easter (March 5) he found an opportunity of explaining the objects of his Bill. They included a proposal to fix the date of the judicial rent as the gale day next following the application to the court; and another to render more operative the purchasing clauses of the Act. Mr. Trevelyan, on behalf of the Government, opposed the Bill, promising to explain at a later date the intentions of Ministers, and the extent to which they would carry out the wishes of the Nationalist members. After a warm debate the motion to read the Bill a second time that day six months was carried by 235 to 72.

On the second reading of Mr. T. Dickson's Land Law Bill (April 30) Mr. Trevelyan had another opportunity of explaining the views of the Government. This bill aimed at extending the purchase clauses of the Irish Land Act, by permitting the establishment of a land corporation with power to purchase estates and to re-sell them to the tenants. He proposed that the Imperial Exchequer should advance to the corporation the necessary amounts, taking as security for the loan the fee-simple of the land and the tenant-right. The amount required would be about 10,000,000*l.*, on which he proposed that the State should guarantee interest at 3 per cent., leaving the terms of repayment to the discretion of the corporation. Mr. Parnell's view was that the State should lend the county boards or other local bodies 10,000,000*l.* a year for ten years, to be spent in the purchase of land for the tenantry, and that it should be paid back by instalments in fifty-two years. The ultimate risk, he was assured by competent actuaries, would not exceed one half of the sum advanced, and he believed that if this proposal were adopted, the unsaleability of land in Ireland would cease, large districts would be transferred to the tenants, and the agrarian question nearly settled. Mr. Trevelyan at once rose, and again begged for further delay. He assured the Irish members that the Government had prepared a Bill to facilitate purchase, which he expected to be able to bring in in the course of a fortnight. He hoped also that the Bill would prove acceptable to all parties concerned, as the Government had formed an intermediary body, which they trusted would work efficiently. Nor did Mr. Trevelyan long postpone the redemption of his promise. Taking advantage of a temporary lull, he explained (May 27) the plan of the Government for facilitating the sale of land to the Irish peasantry. He described land in Ireland as almost unsaleable, the "block" being as great as it was when Sir Robert Peel passed the Encumbered Estates Act. At the same time the purchase clauses of the Act of 1881 had not attracted the farmers. The Government consequently proposed

two important modifications of their original scheme. To peasants who could and would pay one-fourth down the State would lend the other three-fourths, and would so reduce the interest that the buyer, by paying his present rent, or a little less, would cover that interest and the rates which, as owner, would fall on him, and the instalment necessary to extinguish the debt in forty years. Steady payment of present rent, in fact, for forty years would therefore buy the freehold. The second offer was to the tenant who could not or would not pay the one-fourth down. He might become the freeholder in thirty-three years by paying steadily five per cent. upon the sum arranged with his landlord, which it was throughout assumed would be twenty years' purchase, this sum being advanced by the State. In this case, however, the purchaser must satisfy a local board, composed of sixteen delegates from the grand jury and the board of guardians; and in case of default they would have to make the money good out of the local cess. The buyer in both cases would have a perfect title granted him, without expense or trouble, Mr. Trevelyan having carefully faced in his Bill every legal difficulty. The money lent in any one year under the Act would be limited to 5,000,000*l.*, and the total amount to 20,000,000*l.*

These offers, far outstripping anything previously hinted, were not received with as much enthusiasm and gratitude by those they were designed to benefit as doubtless the Ministry anticipated. It was not, therefore, surprising that the sudden closing of the session should have been hailed by Mr. Trevelyan as an excuse for dropping his measure. The representatives of the Irish cottiers in Parliament argued that the condition which made the consent of the local board essential to the advance of the purchase money placed in the hands of the landlords and their nominees an arm by which the operation of the Bill could be rendered nugatory. In default of the payment of the annual instalments by the purchaser, the loss would fall upon the county cess; and to avoid this the members of the local board would raise every sort of difficulty in the way of purchase by an impoverished tenant. At the same time, it was asserted that twenty years' purchase, the term assigned by the Bill, was too high; and certainly, so far as evidence was at hand, the Irish tenants showed every disposition to reduce the value of their holdings, in the eyes of their landlords and of political economists, to a far lower level. Economists also saw objections to a scheme which offered no test as to the prudence of the bargain entered into, more especially as the body on which the State had to depend for payment could give no guarantee of its responsibility. It was, however, in the House of Lords some weeks later (June 16) that the measure was most bitterly attacked by the Duke of Argyll, who took the occasion of repeating all his objections to the Irish Land policy of the Government, denouncing it as a revolutionary measure applied by an arbitrary power. Land was each year, he

declared, more unsaleable in Ireland; and as a set-off against the reduced rents they were receiving, landlords were everywhere reducing their improvements, to the manifest impoverishment of the country. He sincerely pitied the condition of the Irish peasantry, who had been led astray by false guides, and had forced Parliament to enter upon a course of legislation by which the character of that body would be deteriorated. Lord Carlingford, in reply, declared the majority of the Duke of Argyll's survey of the state of Ireland to be quite imaginary. The Land Commissioners acted with far more circumspection and with greater regard for the landlords' interests than the county courts. He admitted that Ireland was passing through a crisis, but denied that it was the result of Liberal policy; and he believed, upon the assurance of impartial judges, that the condition of the country gave every ground for reasonable hope. If the landlords had been discouraged from making improvements, as asserted, the tenants, who had always made the most important ones, were encouraged to pursue their work by the knowledge that they would not lose the profit of their labour and outlay. After some further discussion, in the course of which Lord Derby explained that he had always regarded the Irish Land Act, 1881, as a disagreeable necessity, the subject dropped. It was probably only a coincidence, but a noteworthy one, that just before the Duke of Argyll delivered his diatribe against the working of the Land Act, Mr. Parnell's Land Purchase and Settlement Company made their first offer for an estate. The property, about 2,767 acres, situated in Galway, had been valued by the Government Commissioners at 1,460*l.* per annum, and for this the Company offered 43,000*l.*, or nearly thirty years' purchase, with the object of reselling it in small allotments to the occupying tenants. A side light, moreover, was thrown upon the position of Irish landowners by this affair, for it appeared upon investigation that the encumbrances on the property exceeded the amount offered, the only surviving interest of the nominal owner being in certain arrears of rent which seemed of very doubtful recovery.

Whilst the House of Commons was still busy with the Franchise Bill, and scarcely a symptom of the approaching storm could be perceived, Lord Rosebery startled the general public as much as many of his own order by a motion for an inquiry into the best means for promoting the efficiency of the House of Lords. In the course of a brilliant, and at the same time masterly speech, he sketched the composition of the peers, of whom no less than 116 were, or had been, ministers, judges, ambassadors, bishops, governors-general, Speakers, &c., men of whose aid any legislative body might be justly proud. Nevertheless, their influence with the State was almost imperceptible. The Government of the day paid no attention to their resolutions, and took no heed of their votes of censure. For the greater part of the session, except upon the occasions of an important party vote, there was a bare

attendance. Nothing was represented in the House except the Church, the law, and the hereditary principles. Lord Rosebery then sketched out the lines in which some improvement might be made—the numbers requisite to constitute a “House,” the appointment of joint committees, the advisability of having representatives of medicine, art, science, literature, and commerce—all these were questions with which a select committee might deal with advantage. For himself, he expressed the desire to see the labouring classes also represented in the House of Lords, for there was too much of receiving of rent in that House, and too little of paying it. He held, moreover, that both India and the Colonies might with advantage be more directly represented than was then the case, and urged the committee (if appointed) to consider the question of life peerages; as well as that of obtaining, on special occasions, the attendance of persons who, though not peers, would be called in to deliberate with and advise their lordships, as the judges at one time attended in certain cases of appeal. In an eloquent peroration he called upon his fellow-peers to reform themselves while no one could say that they were acting under panic or pressure; to notice that the House of Commons, for the third time, was broadening, and strengthening, and sinking deeper its foundation, and to remember that they themselves held a triple responsibility—for their own honour, for the honour of their ancestors, and for the honour of their posterity. The motion for a select committee was seconded by the Earl of Onslow, but Lord Granville at once interposed, declaring that to adopt such a motion would be to admit the inefficiency of the House of Lords, a point in which he could not concur. If a committee were appointed in the terms of the motion, its inquiry would at best be a “fishing one.” Lord Salisbury concurred with Lord Granville in this view, but he was by no means opposed to measures for improving the constitution of the House. He had supported the proposal for the creation of life peers, which had been rejected; but even in the absence of such colleagues he held the House of Lords to be an efficient legislative assembly. Lord Granville thereupon suggested that Lord Rosebery should add to his motion the words “by life peerage or otherwise;” but to this Lord Salisbury demurred, stating that, although not opposed to the idea in itself, he was not disposed to agree to the proposal at five minutes’ notice. Lord Granville’s amendment having been formally put, was, after some discussion, rejected by 86 to 44, and Lord Rosebery’s original motion was then negatived by 77 to 38.

From this point the attention of both Houses was concentrated on the Franchise Bill, of which the crisis elsewhere described was now fast approaching. Mr. Gladstone’s speech in the House of Commons (July 10) after the adoption of Lord Cairns’ amendment practically put an end to the legislation of the session. Without any great show of regret or remorse, he announced that, with the exception of the Bills that had passed the Grand Committee (of

which the Corrupt Practices at Municipal Elections was the most important), the Government proposed to abandon nine of their most important measures. The list comprised the London Government Bill, the Railways Regulation Bill, the Universities of Scotland Bill, the Education (Wales) Bill, the Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill, the Sunday Closing (Ireland) Bill, the Coinage Bill, the Police Superannuation Bill, and even the Criminal Law Amendment Bill which had passed the House of Lords. To this list, later in the evening, after having been taunted by Lord R. Churchill and others with displaying petulance and ill-temper in thus rendering the session wholly fruitless, Mr. Gladstone announced that, after the debate which had occurred, the Law of Evidence Bill would also be abandoned.

Practically the remaining interest of the session centred round the Estimates, and the discussions which arose out of or beside them. Some time previously (June 16) Mr. Mundella had found an opportunity of explaining the Education Estimates of the year, which for the first time exceeded three millions for elementary education in England and Wales. He explained that the increase (77,237*l.*) in the preceding year's vote arose mainly under the head of grants to day and evening scholars, the average attendance having increased by three per cent. The schools inspected numbered 18,540, an increase of 251 over the preceding year; and school accommodation was provided for 4,670,000 children, or an increase of 132,000. The number of children on the register was 4,273,000, of whom 3,127,000 were in average attendance, an increase of 84,000 in the first, and of 112,000 in the latter category. Taking night schools and all other elementary schools into account, but not reckoning private adventure schools, public schools, and endowed schools, Mr. Mundella estimated that there were in attendance about 5,080,000 children, thus reaching the ideal of ardent educationalists who maintained that one-sixth of the population should be at school. The improvement in the quality of the teaching, Mr. Mundella admitted, had been more rapid than the number of scholars, for the certificated teachers had increased by 3,153, whilst the number of the pupil teachers had been reduced by 5,324. The total cost per scholar throughout the country showed a decrease of 3*d.* in board schools, as compared with an increase of 3½*d.* in voluntary schools; but taking London alone, the decrease in the cost of board scholars was as much as 1*s.* 2*d.* per head. The Vice-president of the Council was severely blamed for making no allusion to the question of over-pressure; but the public learnt at a subsequent period that an inquiry was at that moment going on under his auspices, by means of which it was hoped that the complaints of the tender-hearted would be completely answered. Of these Earl De la Warr in the House of Lords constituted himself the spokesman (June 27), arguing that the mischief was in a measure due to the system of payment by results. A stupid child was urged

beyond his powers, in order that a higher additional grant might be earned, and consequently schoolmasters and school managers were leagued against the unlucky child. Lord De la Warr, moreover, protested against the constant increase of expenditure on schools, and submitted for the consideration of the Education Department the proposal that some exemption from rates, or other relief, should be accorded to parents whose children attended voluntary schools. The Bishop of Exeter pointed out, in reply, that under the "result system" there was far less risk than formerly that ordinary children would be neglected in order to leave the master free to devote his whole attention to such pupils as would be likely to do him credit and increase his income. He admitted, however, that over-pressure did to an extent exist, and he did not well see how it could be obviated; but the chief sufferers from it were the pupil-teachers and the masters. The subject might have been allowed to drop but for the attempt of the Vice-president to withhold the report of Dr. Crichton Browne, an expert in mental diseases, who had been authorised to make an inquiry into the alleged cases of brain disorders among board-school children. When at length the report was circulated, it was found to be accompanied by a statement denying completely Dr. Crichton Browne's competence to obtain trustworthy results from the data with which he had been provided at the instance of the Education Department. The controversy between the rival champions waxed very bitter, and Mr. Mundella, withdrawing from the discussion, allowed his subordinate to bear the blows or the honours which, according to the sympathies of the public, were his portion. Meanwhile the House of Commons had devoted itself wholly to the business of supply; but, in spite of this concentration of energy, small and slow progress was made from day to day. Upon most of the votes, it must be allowed, interesting discussions were raised, but in some instances, when Irish votes were under consideration, the debates were protracted to a very unnecessary extent. On the vote for the Local Government Board, Mr. Sexton (July 16) made some very just complaints of the parsimony and bigotry which too often lead the guardians of the poor on the one hand to refuse to pay a Roman Catholic chaplain, and on the other to prevent Roman Catholic children from getting religious instruction outside the workhouse. Mr. George Russell replied, that there was an "increasing disinclination" on the part of boards of guardians to provide religious instruction for any class of pauper children. The Lunacy Commissioners were, it was assumed, to be placed under the control of a Government department, and it was admitted on all sides that in the present state of the law on this subject it would be scarcely possible to make a change which would not be an improvement. On the vote for the Charity Commission, including the Endowed Schools Commission, Mr. Jesse Collings censured the Commission for doing the very things which the Radicals of fifteen years before were most anxious that it should

do. From the point of view of its creators it was a merit, not a fault, in the Endowed Schools Commission that it disregarded local claims, promoted the higher education at the cost of elementary, and subordinated the interests of the poor to those of the classes who are able to pay for their children's schooling. Mr. Jesse Collings attacked the Commission (July 17) in terms that recalled the censures so often evoked by the action of the first Commissioners. Mr. Mundella declared that the "antiquated and Conservative" doctrines advanced by Mr. Collings would not "bear the light of day," and he proposed to appoint in the following session a select committee to inquire into the working of the Endowed Schools Act.

The Vote for the expenses of the Chief Secretary's Office was the cause of a protracted discussion (July 26), but the attempt of the Irish Home Rulers to effect any reduction in either this Vote or that for the Lord-Lieutenant's household received no support outside their own group. On a subsequent occasion, when the Vote for the Valuation and Boundary Survey (July 23) came on, Mr. Sexton commented in strong terms on the character and position of Mr. Bolton, the Crown Prosecutor in Dublin, especially calling attention to the latter's conduct in the discharge of his official duties in certain proceedings in bankruptcy, and in an action for libel then undecided. Mr. Sexton therefore moved to reduce the Vote by the amount of Mr. Bolton's salary. This course was opposed by Mr. Courtney, on the ground that it would be unfair to prejudice a case still in dispute, undertaken by Mr. Bolton to vindicate his character. A very general feeling was expressed in different parts of the House in favour of Mr. Bolton's suspension from office during the investigation of the charges made against him, but the Solicitor-General for Ireland pointed out the objection to such a course being taken by the Executive; and, finally, Mr. Sexton's motion was negatived by 116 to 58. Mr. Bolton's case was again brought forward on the Vote for Law Charges and Prosecution (July 29), but after a promise from Mr. Gladstone that if the Vote were passed the report should not be taken until after the result of the trial in which Mr. Bolton was concerned was known, the Irish members withdrew their opposition. On a subsequent occasion (July 24) Mr. Sexton raised, on the Vote for County and Borough Police, a long discussion on the riot of Cleator Moor, arising out of an Orange procession, Mr. Parnell insisting that the Government might have stopped it beforehand, and expressing the hope that the Government would take every precaution for the protection of the Irish in England. On the Vote for Diplomatic Services, Sir Wilfrid Lawson called attention (August 4) to the banishment of Mr. Wilfred Blunt from Egypt, and the treatment to which he had been subjected by Sir Evelyn Baring. Lord E. Fitzmaurice justified the Egyptian Government in excluding from their territory a person whom they deemed dangerous to the security of the State and the mainten-

ance of public order. Mr. Gladstone supported his subordinate against the chorus of hostile criticism to which the conduct of the Egyptian Ministry had given rise. He added that Mr. W. Blunt's relations with Arabi, and the revolutionary movement of which the latter had been the head, made it extremely inexpedient that, under existing circumstances, he should visit Egypt. The rights of the Catholic subjects of the Queen, the treaty with the King of Abyssinia (August 4), Public Education in Ireland (August 5), Queen's Colleges, and the relaxations proposed to be made to the Telephone Companies (August 9) were amongst some of the many topics discussed in Supply, which was not finally closed at an earlier date than under ordinary circumstances. In the House of Lords, the only acts which called for notice, and in each case the example of Mr. Gladstone's action was cited as an excuse or a reason, were the withdrawal of Lord Houghton's Bill for legalising Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister (July 10), the rejection of the Irish Poor Law Guardians Bill (July 24), by which the ballot was to be extended to poor law elections, and the refusal to proceed with Mr. Bryce's Infants Bill (August 4), the main object of which was to give both parents an equal right to the guardianship of infants. Mr. Bryce had, with great skill and perseverance, carried this measure through the House of Commons, but it did not reach the Lords soon enough, as Lord Bramwell argued, to give sufficient time for the consideration of so great a change in the law.

Long ere this, however, all interest in what was taking place in Parliament had ceased, and statesmen of all parties recognising that public attention was transferred to a more public place, were busy settling the plans of the autumn campaign. Several meetings had been held even before the formal closing of the session, and at them party cries were raised so loud and menaces of attack and reprisal scattered so freely, that it was not without some reason that in the speech from the throne (August 14) an appeal should be made to both leaders, and to the nation in favour of order and moderation.

CHAPTER VI.

THE AUTUMN RECESS.

Earl Cowper's Letter—Conservative Gathering at Nostell Priory—Mr. Gladstone in Midlothian—Mr. Trevelyan at Glasgow—Sir S. Northcote at Edinburgh—Mr. Morley at Newcastle—Mr. Gladstone's Return from Scotland—Lord Salisbury on Redistribution—The Conservative Campaign in Scotland—Lord Hartington's offer—Mr. Chamberlain at Hanley—The "Standard's" Redistribution Scheme—The Gathering at Chatsworth—Mr. Fawcett's Speech—Mr. Chamberlain in Wales—The State of the Navy—Colonial and Foreign Affairs.

FOR some time previous to the prorogation public interest, as has been said, had shifted from Westminster to the provinces. The debates and divisions of the session had shown conclusively that if any agreement were to be arrived at, or any concessions to be given or extorted, it must be by means of pressure from outside. To stir up popular opinion and to enlist it on their own side was therefore the task of the moment; and both parties accepted the duty without hesitation. Throughout the short recess of little more than two months scarcely a day passed without one or more meetings being held, at which speakers of greater or less ability repeated with little variation their well-learned lesson. In the mouths of the Liberals the action of the Peers in resisting the will of the people was denounced as little short of treason, whilst the Conservatives claimed that the people should at least be allowed to express openly their approval of the benefits it was proposed to confer upon the country by means of a widely-extended franchise. In bygone times, when intercommunication between widely-separated parts of the country was tedious and untrustworthy, the means adopted by each party to disseminate its views would not have seemed extravagant; but when morning after morning the newspapers reported speeches all fashioned after one model, rarely lightened by a single distinctive trait, a sense of weariness rather than of conviction by argument took possession of the public mind, and on all sides, under more or less thin disguise, the hope went up that the deadlock at which the two Houses of the Legislature had arrived might be removed, and the terms of a settlement devised by which neither party would have to recall too openly the terms of unconditional surrender which each had insisted upon for the other. Now and again a gleam of hope was descried in one speaker's words, only to be hidden beneath a thicker cloud of doubt when the answer came from some far-off platform. At another moment it seemed as if the leaders of both parties were so undecided as to the immediate present, that onlookers could scarcely understand that their respective landmarks were absolutely immovable. When, again, the prospects of satisfactory settlement seemed brightest,

an angry or ill-advised speech from an influential party leader would suggest that the country would find no issue from its dilemma short of a revolution.

The real truth probably lay outside all these considerations; the frequent public meetings aroused popular interest in a question which otherwise excited but a limited enthusiasm; the actual hold of the aristocracy upon the nation was more clearly ascertained by those who wished to reduce or destroy its influence; and the conclusion was forced upon both sides that the only reasonable hope of settlement lay in mutual concessions.

It was probably not wholly an undesigned coincidence that Earl Cowper's letter to the *Times* should have been dated on the day of the prorogation of Parliament. In Mr. Gladstone's Government as originally constituted Lord Cowper had held the important post of Irish Viceroy, and although he had retired almost simultaneously with Mr. Forster (on the release of the Kilmainham political prisoners), he had not, like the latter, taken any active part in criticising or obstructing the policy of the Government. In the debate on the Franchise Bill he had voted with the minority, and subsequently, on Lord Wemyss' motion, had also acted in full accord with the Ministerial party; his allegiance to his former chiefs was therefore unquestionable. His letter, which appeared at the very commencement of the Parliamentary recess, furnished materials for many speeches, and as it pointed in the direction of the subsequent settlement, by a plain declaration of the difficulties in the way of Government intimidation, it acquired at a later date more value than was accorded it at the time of its publication.

"The Government," wrote Earl Cowper, "seem determined to present their Bill once more in the autumn for the acceptance or rejection of the House just as it now stands, unaccompanied by any other measure; and it is hardly conceivable that any assembly should be so wanting in self-respect and consistency as to swallow in November what they refused in July. There will be no excuse for their doing so, for the only change of circumstance will be that they will in the meantime have been subjected to a great many threats and a vast amount of abuse. I spoke as strongly in debate as my powers of language would permit against the House of Lords assuming the position which it has taken up; but now that this position has once been occupied, the evil of abandoning it without any assignable reason and in the face of such violent clamour would, I feel, be very great. The blow inflicted by such conduct upon the influence and prestige of the Second Chamber would be only inferior to that which was given by its sudden collapse in 1832, in order to avoid being swamped by an overwhelming creation of new peers. I cannot myself conceive the possibility of the House of Lords giving way."

Lord Cowper then went on to sketch out the line which he thought the Government ought to follow under the circumstances:

"The Government admitted in the debate on Lord Wemyss's motion that they can if they choose present a Redistribution Bill in the autumn. I say at once, boldly, that though I call myself a good Liberal, I consider that, as they admit the possibility of this, it is their duty to do it. I know that it would require some courage to pursue the course I recommend. But what would be the effect as to the real objects and manœuvres of the Opposition leaders? Would they not be foiled and frustrated in the most complete manner? . . . The real object of the Conservative leaders was pretty well known from the first, and they now no longer even attempt to disguise it. To force a dissolution as soon as possible and with the present constituencies, before the defeats of Hicks and Baker and the massacre of the Egyptian garrisons are forgotten, and while it can still be asserted with plausibility that Gordon has been abandoned—this is what the Tories wished for. . . . For the present, Parliament ought properly to come to an end in another year, and in two years it will run out. Unless, therefore, the Government are prepared to declare their Bill carried, and to proceed to act upon it without the consent of the House of Lords—which would amount to a revolution—the Conservatives must win the trick."

Arguments, however, of this sort for the moment were without weight, and pending the expression of opinion as to their weight by some member of the Cabinet, Lord Carnarvon at Highclere (August 16) complained bitterly of the misrepresentation and falsification of fact which Conservatives had to encounter; and Mr. Gibson (August 18) at Halifax twitted the Government with their desire to substitute "agitation with limited liabilities" for the "appeal to the conscience of the people" which Mr. Chamberlain had promised (January 29) before the contest over the Franchise Bill really commenced.

Lord Cowper's "compromise," as it was termed, attracted but little attention during the first few days after its publication. The first intimation that it had awakened an echo in Ministerial circles was conveyed by the *Daily News* (August 22), which was supposed to reproduce with photographic accuracy the shifting views of the Cabinet on questions of home and foreign politics. "Powerful influences," it wrote, "are being brought to bear in favour of the acceptance of Lord Cowper's compromise, and within the Government itself there is a disposition not unfavourable to it." There was, however, some reason to doubt the solid foundation of any such hopes, inasmuch as Lord Cowper's proposal that the printing of the Ministerial Redistribution Bill should be met by the passing of the Franchise Bill would scarcely have removed the objections of Lord Salisbury, who had insisted upon the second reading at least of a Redistribution Bill, accepted and endorsed by both parties, before the Peers should consent to the passing of the Franchise Bill. The organs of the Liberal party were as agreed on the expediency and practicability of the former course as they were

convinced that their leaders neither could nor would consent to the alternative suggested by the Conservatives. Meanwhile the leaders on both sides kept silence. Sir S. Northcote and Lord Carnarvon, speaking at a great gathering of Yorkshire Conservatives at Nostell Priory, near Wakefield, made no reference to the "compromise." The former directed his remarks chiefly against the Liberals, who by a side issue were attempting to tamper with the Constitution, and drew a contrast between Mr. Gladstone's counsels, to treat the question in dispute with calmness and moderation, and his eagerness to place himself at the head of the agitation against the House of Lords. He declared that Mr. Bright's repudiation of a Franchise Bill without redistribution was only a further instance of that statesman's misfortune in misleading them as to his real meaning; and he went to explain the reason why the Conservatives attached so much importance to the redistribution question.

"You know very well," he added, "that there are great complaints made—and it is one of the arguments for an alteration of our electoral system—that in certain places a very small number of electors return more members than are returned by other large constituencies in other places. Let me ask you, without troubling you with many figures, to listen to this. There are 153 boroughs which contain less than 5,000 electors, and there are 101 counties or divisions of counties which contain more than 5,000 electors. The 153 boroughs have between them 280,000 electors in all, and they return 191 members of Parliament—that is to say, one for every 1,500 voters. The 101 counties have a million electors in all, and they return 201 members of Parliament, or about one member for every 5,000 electors, so that the value of the vote in a borough is just three times the amount of the value of a vote in the county. But what is the remedy proposed? Not to alter anything of that kind, but to add largely to the number of voters in the counties; so that these 101 counties, instead of having about a million voters, will have 2,700,000, or one member for about 14,000, and in that way you see that the value of a borough vote, instead of being three times what it is in the county, will be nine times its value."

A resolution was carried by acclamation approving the action of the Peers, "in performing a constitutional duty by preventing an incomplete measure being passed into law." Lord Carnarvon, turning away from home affairs, condemned the vacillating conduct of the Government in the affairs of Egypt, and the policy by which the Colonies were being alienated. This resolution, as well as another demanding a dissolution of Parliament, was carried with enthusiasm in a meeting, of which the Liberals minimised the size and importance as persistently as the Conservatives magnified the one and the other.

The gathering at Nostell Priory was only one of a hundred, and differed only in its being more numerous attended, and in

being addressed by recognised party leaders. In point of numbers, although individually it may have brought together the largest crowds, the Liberals could point to half a dozen public meetings for every one summoned by their opponents; and all who attended represented the views of those who summoned the meetings. They could moreover claim in the Midland and Northern counties, and in Scotland, a decided majority amongst the frequenters of public meetings. More than this could scarcely be deduced from these gatherings. The speeches, especially on the Liberal side, were carefully vague and obscure, until Mr. Gladstone's Midlothian utterances gave the cue to his followers. Meanwhile, Liberal opinion with regard to Lord Cowper's proposal had been maturing. Radicals of the type of Mr. Broadhurst protested that its adoption would be fatal to the confidence placed by the great majority of the party in Mr. Gladstone, and declared his conviction that the Government would not give it a moment's consideration. The Whigs also, so far as Mr. Heneage might be accepted as their spokesman, were opposed to the notion. In a letter to the *Times* (August 23) he argued that there was no question of any quarrel between the House of Lords (as a whole) and the Government, but merely an act of two-fifths of the Peerage, who had placed their House in opposition to a Bill passed by a large majority in the House of Commons. Similar tactics in 1846 had obliged the Duke of Wellington to declare that the safety of the House of Lords was compromised, when opposition of this character was displayed.

From newspaper discussions, however, public attention was soon drawn away, to be concentrated on Mr. Gladstone's "triumphal progress" from Hawarden to Dalmeny. Before reaching the Scotch border (August 28), at every station where the train stopped he was met by enthusiastic crowds; but he limited his speeches to a few words at Warrington, where he assured his hearers that the issue of the struggle was in the hands of the country; that the Government would not go about seeking or entreating support, but would do their duty if the people did theirs. After crossing the border his advice wore the same colour, declaring that the real question was not whether the Liberal party supported the Government, but whether the Liberal party in this matter was truly representative of the people. At Edinburgh a most remarkable ovation awaited him: all business was stopped, the streets were filled with closely-packed enthusiastic crowds, and the whole way—from the Caledonian Station to Dalmeny—was thronged by thousands eager to do honour to their representative.

Two days, however, elapsed, before Mr. Gladstone formally addressed the electors of Midlothian. In his first speech (August 30), at the Edinburgh Corn Exchange, Mr. Gladstone began by explaining that the special purpose for which he visited his constituents was to promote, by every legitimate means in his power, the speedy passing of the Franchise Bill. The unfortunate rejection

tion of that Bill had already drawn in its train other questions of the gravest kind, and had suggested to the minds of the vast proportion of the people the inquiry whether the time had not come when it might be necessary to study the means of introducing an organic change in the constitution of the House of Lords. Mr. Gladstone continued :—

“Into that question it is not my intention on this occasion to enter. The controversy now before us with regard to the Franchise Bill is sufficiently weighty, and the field sufficiently wide. Should the passing of that measure be delayed, I have not a doubt that the field of that controversy will become wider still ; but my duty as a Minister of the Crown, speaking for myself, and, I believe, expressing with tolerable fidelity the opinions of my colleagues—my duty as a Minister of the Crown is not to look into the far future while the work of the day demands every energy, and more than every energy, that we possess. What we want is a national expression of opinion, in the constitutional modes familiar to this country, upon this great question—namely, whether two millions of our fellow-subjects are to be admitted to a share in political and parliamentary power. That is enough for me to raise before you. Others are more free to enter into what may or may not happen in the ulterior stages of this great conflict, but, for my part, I seek to avoid them. It may be the timidity of age—it may be indolence, from which none of us are altogether free ; but I own to you that I look with reluctance to entering upon questions of organic change in the constitution of this country, unless and until the moment comes when I can no longer deny their necessity. I do not believe that the House of Lords has as yet placed itself in a position of irretrievable error. I believe it to be possible that it may go back, and may go back with dignity and with honour. If it does, I for my part would rejoice in our having been enabled to obtain an enormous national advantage, without the prolonged and almost inextricable conflict that would necessarily beset and encumber the whole question of the franchise, if that great controversy came to be mixed up as to its practical issues with another controversy greater perhaps still, or at any rate more difficult. As a Minister of the Crown, my duty is to look to the question of the day. The question of the day, such as it is now before me, is, God knows, enough for me, and it is that upon which I wish to bring home to you the proposition I would lay before you.”

He then went on to show that the Franchise Bill was a most moderate one, full of concessions to Conservative feeling ; that it had been accepted by large majorities by the Commons, and passed the third reading by a practically unanimous vote ; that its stoppage by the Lords on account of the absence of a Redistribution Bill was a dishonest plea ; that the claim of the Peers to dictate a dissolution was novel and unconstitutional. The Bill, according to the majority of the Peers, aimed at a revision of the

Constitution. Mr. Gladstone maintained that it was not even an innovation; that the Bill did not "alter the relations or powers or rights of the different orders of the State, or of the bodies by which the self-governing energy of the nation takes effect in law and in acts of government." The suffrage proposed for the counties was that adopted by the Tories for the boroughs, and the introduction of "the service franchise had been accepted by the Conservatives." The Redistribution Bill was postponed because its introduction would have rendered the passing of the Reform Bill impossible. Government, allowing for the natural business of supply and votes of censure, had thirty-one nights at its disposal, and of these twenty-five were occupied in the discussion of the Franchise Bill. The reason, therefore, of the rejection of that measure by the Lords was to be sought elsewhere, and although he refused to "widen out the issue," the conviction forced itself upon his mind that "the legislative action of the House of Lords for the last fifty years has not been a benefit or a blessing to the country." The whole meeting, at the first suggestion of menace to the House of Lords, rose and applauded enthusiastically, but Mr. Gladstone carefully checked this outburst, concentrating his arguments upon the defence of the Constitution as it existed, protesting only against the Lords' claim to pass whenever they might choose capital sentence on the Commons. "To tamper with that doctrine," he exclaimed, "to give it the smallest countenance, to admit one jot or tittle of it, would, in my opinion, be treason to British liberty; and I tell you fairly, I would far rather abandon my share in the Franchise Bill, and that which would go with it, my share in political life, than for one moment cease to raise the loudest protest in my power against the introduction of this greatest innovation which, neither in a reformed Parliament nor in an unreformed Parliament, was ever heard of, by a majority of the House of Lords." In answer to the theory that of the two Houses the more permanent representative body had the right to ask the people, who are the masters of both, whether they approved of the Bill, Mr. Gladstone denied utterly that the Upper House was in any sense representative. If they were so they would not so constantly have found themselves opposed to popular wishes and aims. But on this aspect of the question he did not desire to dwell, for the Government had striven to avoid a conflict with the Upper House, and were anxious, as far as they were permitted, not to extend its field. "We feel bound," he said, "in a friendly sense, to warn the House of Lords against that extension; but at the same time, I have endeavoured to urge this question so as to make an appeal to the reason of that assembly, and not to its fears. I will not abandon the hope that reason will prevail until painful demonstration compels me to relinquish it." It was unwise and dangerous for an hereditary Chamber upon a great constitutional issue to court a direct conflict with the representative House, which pro-

ceeds from the people, which returns to the people, and which, if the people are dissatisfied with its action, is punished by the people as the Parliament of 1874 was punished in 1880. Every consideration alike of principle and of policy—and even of narrow and selfish interest, if that might be appealed to—dictated that they should no longer tamper with the question, but seize the first opportunity of giving a ready assent to the Franchise Bill.

Mr. Gladstone's second speech (September 1) was devoted to a vindication of the Government policy at home and abroad, and to answer the constant criticisms to which his realisation of the Midlothian programme of 1879 had been subjected. After referring to the deplorable inheritance to which the successors of Lord Salisbury had succeeded, dealing first with financial questions, Mr. Gladstone declared that whilst the last four years of Conservative administration had resulted in a deficiency of 7,330,000*l.*, the Liberal Government in its first four years had had a surplus of 1,550,000*l.*, had lowered the Malt tax and Probate duties, had paid off a large portion of the National Debt, and had reduced the national expenditure. In Ireland, they had found themselves confronted by a vast conspiracy; but, thanks to the legislation they had carried out, crime had greatly diminished, and its quality was not serious. He did not assert that the Irish question was altogether settled, but "parliamentary and political difficulties are one thing, and social difficulties are another." There might again be outbursts of crime, but nothing, he believed, like what they had had to contend with was be feared in the future of that most interesting country.

Mr. Gladstone then turned to foreign policy, his idea of which was that our security in our island home should not "betray us into a temper of arrogance," but we should "take for our rule that simple rule drawn from the highest source, and endeavour to behave to each and all of them as we wish them to behave to us." He looked with "satisfaction, sympathy, and joy" upon the "expansion of Germany," and said it would be "the utmost meanness" for us to be jealous of German colonisation. Mr. Gladstone then reviewed the policy of the Government in Eastern Europe, Afghanistan, India, and South Africa, and with respect to the Transvaal contended that "they were strong and could afford to be merciful," and that it was not possible without the grossest and most shameless breach of faith to persist in holding the Boers to annexation "when we had pledged ourselves beforehand that they should not be annexed except with their own goodwill."

Coming at length to Egypt, Mr. Gladstone said his answer to the oft-repeated question "What took you to Egypt?" was, "Honour, and plighted faith." The covenants they were keeping were those entered into by their Tory predecessors, and most unfortunate and unwise he considered them to be. Nevertheless,

there were plain duties before the Government in the regulation of Egyptian affairs.

"We have endeavoured to keep faith with the Sovereign of the country; we have endeavoured to maintain the honour of the British arms; we have respected the sovereignty of the Porte and the title of the European Powers to be concerned in all matters territorial affecting the Turkish Empire; we have discouraged the spirit of aggression as well as we could. We have contracted no embarrassing engagements. I won't go back now on the engagement partially made with France, because it has ceased to exist, and would tend unnecessarily to expend your time. We have endeavoured to regulate Egyptian finance upon the principle of a fair distribution of effort and sacrifice among all parties, and I greatly lament the total failure of the late Conference of the Powers of Europe to solve that problem of Egyptian finance, because the assemblage of the European Powers is a great organ of civilised authority on behalf of the peace and happiness of Europe, and a gross failure such as this in the execution of the duty which, in our judgment at least, and in the judgment of two Powers among them, was perfectly practicable, is a very considerable blow to their authority."

The only good point in the Egyptian case was that great improvements have been introduced in the administration of Egypt, noiseless but real, and would, he hoped, leave behind them when they quitted Egypt traces honourable to the British name. Mr. Gladstone continued:—"We are now engaged in considering the best means we can adopt for fulfilling our obligations to the gallant General Gordon. We do not know, from the unhappy intercepting of communication, what his present condition, occupation, and views may be, and, therefore, precisely what these obligations are; but we are putting ourselves in a position to fulfil them, whatever they may be, and in so doing I believe we are acting upon what would be the general and reasonable wish of the people of this country, who will never allow its agents, while they are honourably endeavouring to give effect to its policy, to be abandoned. I don't know what may happen about General Gordon, but what I rather expect is this. Should the mission of General Gordon fail, I think you will find that the whole Tory party will then discover that they disapproved of it from the first, but that they were too patriotic to say so. On the other hand, should the mission of General Gordon succeed in effecting a peaceful evacuation of the Soudan, and warding off the flood of war from Egypt, then, I think, it is not unlikely that the Tory party will say, 'Oh, we always approved of this mission, and we saw that it was a grand stroke of policy, but we were too modest to claim any share of the credit.'"

In conclusion Mr. Gladstone referred to the question of Parliamentary obstruction, and declared that very large changes in the organisation of the House must be made if the business of the

country had to be done. "There was no organic reform of the House of Lords which could, in my opinion, do half so much for the progress of liberty, for the maintenance of the credit of Parliament, and for the general welfare of the country, as a sound, judicious, and sufficient change in the rules of the House of Commons, so as to enable it to do its business." His last words were words of warning to the House of Lords not to persist in a conflict with the Commons, and expressing a hope that "the great assembly, calling back to life the glorious traditions of its remoter past, may take the course which will best tend to place it in close harmony with the affections of the nation, and to prolong its own existence for an honourable share through ages yet to come in the direction of the fortunes of this mighty Empire."

In the evening of the same day Mr. Gladstone attended a mass meeting of working-men in the Waverley Market, by whom he was enthusiastically received—indicative that his policy and its difficulties had not lessened their confidence nor chilled their attachment. Mr. Gladstone repeated very much the same arguments used in his first speech as to the necessity of separating Redistribution from the Franchise Bill, and his complaints that his efforts to conciliate his opponents had met with no return.

On leaving Edinburgh Mr. Gladstone went northward, and at several places found opportunities of addressing the crowds which had assembled to greet him. In most cases these speeches were more or less repetitions of what he had said at Edinburgh,—that the action of the House of Lords could not be defended, and ought not to be persisted in, and that the solution of the deadlock lay with the nation. Without attempting to refute any of his arguments, the Tory papers and speakers accepted this last dictum, adding that the only constitutional method known of gauging popular opinion was at the polling-booths, and they accused the Ministry of shrinking from that test and substituting for it noisy and irrepressible agitation. As for Lord Cowper's compromise, Mr. Gladstone had only once alluded to it, but his words were interpreted by some to indicate a willingness to consider it. "Lord Cowper," he said, "had not been able to assure us that the Tories are ready to enter into that bargain. I don't know whether the Liberals would be ready to enter into it; but at any rate, you will excuse me for saying that, in the view of moderate men, it would be at least premature on my part to consider, until I see whether the same large section, at any rate, of the Tory party—a considerable share of the majority which had destroyed our Bill in the House of Lords—is ready to accept, that method as a sort of satisfaction to its honour."

The Liberal demonstration at Glasgow (September 6) showed that western Scotland was not less in earnest than the east coast; and although the stirring voice of the Prime Minister was not heard, Mr. Trevelyan, to whom, above and before all others, the movement in favour of an extended franchise was due, found an

opportunity of testing the reality of the gratitude which the measure, the result of his patient advocacy, evoked among the people. The reception he met with must have removed any doubt as to popular interest and satisfaction in that part of the kingdom. Speaking, doubtless, under the restraint imposed by the head of the Cabinet upon his colleagues and subordinates, Mr. Trevelyan limited himself to denouncing the folly of the Peers in provoking an arduous and unnecessary contest, and to exposing the fallacy of the doctrine that the new county householders would swamp the agricultural interest. He pointed to Lord Salisbury as the sole author of the resistance to enfranchisement without redistribution, and asserted that the House of Lords, not the Conservative party, desired to withhold the franchise from the agricultural population. On the subject of his own department (Irish affairs) Mr. Trevelyan was ominously silent, and his attitude was interpreted by the Irish organs as evidence that he was either "sick of his dirty work at the Castle," as the *Freeman's Journal* expressed it, or else was anxious to avoid saying anything in defence of "vigorous government" which might irritate the Irish party; and his approaching exchange to some more congenial office was prophesied by the same newspaper.

It would be well-nigh impossible, and certainly tedious, to attempt to follow all the speakers who, from John o' Groat's to the Land's End, took part in the "informal plébiscite" as it was termed. In point of numbers, both of meetings and attendance, the Liberals showed an enormous preponderance. Whether, in the event of the Liberal programme being carried through unaltered, all those who were eager for reform would be prepared to support the reformers, was a question on which there was less unanimity of opinion. Nevertheless, full credit was due to the Liberal party managers for arousing popular interest in every nook of the kingdom; and it was only fair that they should find their reward in popular approval.

The cordial and almost enthusiastic reception accorded to Sir S. Northcote (September 15) at Edinburgh might have been only further evidence of the love of fair-play, of which Birmingham, Manchester, and Sheffield had already furnished proofs; or it might have been merely admiration for the talents and straightforward character of the leader of the Opposition. From a party point of view it was very important that some reply should be made to Mr. Gladstone's bill of indictment; and probably Sir S. Northcote was well advised in making his rejoinder before the audience which might have heard the charges. From the first moment of his arrival he insisted that the question at issue was not between those who were for and those who were against an extension of the franchise; but whether we were going into extension with our eyes open or shut. If the Government, he declared, would lay their whole scheme before Parliament, it would receive candid consideration on the part of the Conservatives.

Speaking subsequently at the Corn Exchange, he devoted himself chiefly to replying to Mr. Gladstone's recent speeches, and dealt with the subjects of the franchise and redistribution, the national finance, the attack upon the House of Lords, and foreign policy. He contended that if the Franchise and Redistribution Bills had been brought in together they might have been passed during the late session. In foreign affairs he held that the Government had failed. They were now engaged in a third Egyptian war which might have been avoided by fair and courageous action in the earlier stages of the question, while in South Africa the country had submitted to a degradation such as no British statesman had ever submitted to before.

Almost simultaneously Mr. Gladstone, at Aberdeen, was giving food for hope and reflection to those who were desirous for the more "forward" policy in dealing with the obstacles in the way of reform. On his way thither, at Montrose, he had expressed his conviction that if Lord Beaconsfield had been alive the Franchise Bill would have already passed; but on arriving at his destination, in reply to addresses from the Aberdeen Trades Council and Liberal Association, he indicated the immediate programme of the party in words which were regarded as indicating a fresh phase of the struggle:—"It is, gentlemen, by a united action on your part—a constitutional and an orderly, but a perfectly determined action—that we shall, as I trust, achieve the purpose we have in view. I rejoice to see that the working classes of Aberdeen speak of an unfortunate vote on the Franchise Bill as given by a majority of the House of Lords, for they know that there are many members of the House of Lords than whom there are no better friends to the cause of liberty. It is no desire of mine to carry the public of this country into the discussion of wide constitutional and organic changes if it can be avoided, and I yet hope it may be avoided. There is an opportunity yet remaining, and I look with hope to the wisdom which has on various occasions characterised the House of Lords to recover the consequences of the unfortunate step of last July. Gentlemen, you may rely upon it, that on my part and on the part of my colleagues no effort will be wanting. We shall not in this matter leave you in the lurch."

Mr. John Morley, in addressing his constituents at Newcastle-on-Tyne (September 15), took advantage of his freedom from official restraint to enunciate very plainly the views of the most thoughtful of the Radical section, both as regards Egypt and the franchise question. The mission of Lord Northbrook, which had been announced just before the prorogation, had up to that moment given no sign of any change in the policy of the British Government. On his arrival he had set himself diligently to ascertain the real condition of the Egyptian finances; and had personally investigated the condition of the fellahen on the Daira estates and elsewhere in Lower Egypt. Meanwhile, the Government at home had determined to attempt vigorously the rescue of General

Gordon, from whom tidings had at length been received. Lord Wolseley was entrusted with the task, and, as on a former occasion, it was understood that he was to be left free in the choice of both men and means to effect the purpose in view. The general approval with which this step was received, although its long delay was strongly disapproved in most quarters, would have suggested the thought that there was only one course of action open to the Ministry; and that, however reluctantly, they were of necessity obliged to follow it. Mr. John Morley, however, thought differently, and the endorsement his views received from a very important gathering of his constituents showed that those views were shared by others besides philosophical Radicals. He said:—"There were still two policies before them. Some people would go for what they called 'grasping the nettle.' 'Grasping the nettle' meant keeping English garrisons in Egypt for at least fifteen or twenty years, if not for ever. It meant keeping England a military Power in Europe, though we had our hands full, and more than full, in meeting the military demands upon us as things were. There was another policy—to accept the assurances that France was ready to give, that when we left Egypt she would not go there, to prepare a plan for the neutralisation of Egyptian territory, and to place that arrangement under the sanction of the Powers of Europe. That was the scheme which the Government had been labouring to realise, and though for the moment the European confederacy of bondholders had been too strong, it was to this policy that the Government might be expected to adhere."

Mr. Morley then came to what he termed the question of questions, the quarrel whether the elected representatives of the nation were to be responsible for the way in which they chose to divide their work, and whether, if the House of Commons did not happen to please the hereditary peers, the House of Lords was at liberty to send the House of Commons about its business.

The House of Lords (he said) was a piece of machinery, so they were told, expressly devised to represent all that was wise, all that was calm, all that was judicial, all that was safe; yet these men, who were so calm, had wantonly filled the land with strife. These safe men had landed us in a dangerous constitutional controversy. The wise and judicial men had made one of the great institutions of the land into the instrument of a mere party move. They had what he believed was the very worst case—the case that was worst in the greatest number of ways—that was ever known in the whole course of our political history.

They would ask what was to be done. He confessed that he was not looking too far ahead in this matter. The immediate question was to execute the work of the reform of the House of Commons. Then, when the people of the country found something or other more like a true voice, when they were no longer muffled and manacled like men in a nightmare, it would not be

long before the urgent task of still further shortening the arm of the House of Lords was undertaken.

It was a strange coincidence that Mr. Morley's speech should have been almost immediately followed by Lord Northbrook's direct intervention between the Egyptian Government and the bondholders. The former, acting under the instructions, or as it was called the "advice," of the British High Commissioner, suspended for six weeks the payment into the Caisse de la Dette Publique of the surplus revenues effected towards the formation of a sinking fund. The administrative necessities of Egypt were, in Lord Northbrook's opinion, so urgent as to demand the temporary violation of the Law of Liquidation. In France, where the bondholders and financial rings had greater opportunities of making their displeasure known, the bitterest hostility was displayed towards Lord Northbrook and the English Cabinet and people. In England, on the contrary, the step met with almost universal approval. Those organs which had most severely blamed the Government for its supineness and hesitation in Egypt, welcomed an act which promised to inaugurate a more definite policy; whilst such as had all along urged the assumption of a protectorate over the country, saw in Lord Northbrook's act, as well as in Lord Wolseley's presence, additional reason to believe that the adoption of their programme had become inevitable.

The homeward journey of the two leaders was marked with few incidents of importance. At Newcastle Sir Stafford Northcote, in receiving deputations from numerous Conservative societies (September 23), alluded to the hostility against the House of Lords which the Liberals were eagerly provoking; and he urged that if it were to fall, it would not fall alone. It was the interest of all parties to strengthen the Constitution, and the Prime Minister had, in introducing the Franchise Bill, declared that this was also the aim of that measure. The difference between the two parties was that, whilst the Conservatives wished to work for the common object in the light, the Liberals were content to do so in the dark. Mr. Gladstone, on the other hand, in replying to an address at Perth (Sept. 24) showed that his views since he had left Edinburgh had undergone some modification. He thought that the House of Lords would do well to give way to the expressed opinion of the representative chamber, supported by the general voice of the nation, "and recede from this, for them, ill-starred, unhappy, and, if continued, most menacing conflict." He continued:—"There has been a great disposition to raise the question whether the power at present enjoyed by the House of Lords is not a power too great to be held by persons irresponsible for its exercise. You will notice that I have used every effort in my power to keep back that question. I confess I am unwilling that the country should be further perplexed, should be carried into deeper and into wider controversy by raising organic questions upon the constitution of one branch of the Legislature with the

view of serious and fundamental change. In that sense I have laboured, and I have done my best. I think I have tried the patience of the Liberal party by the lengths that I have gone in that direction. My object is to get the Franchise Bill settled. When we get the Franchise Bill settled depend upon it, not only will redistribution of seats immediately follow, but likewise you will be again embarked in, as I hope, a peaceful period of legislative improvement, with better means and with better hopes than ever, and I am willing, gladly willing, if I can, to compound for getting that improvement. For that reason I confine myself to what is intended, at all events, to be a moderate, temperate, and rational appeal to the prudence of the majority of the House of Lords; to point out to them how unreasonable it is to force a principle like the hereditary principle into conflict with the great power and conviction of the nation. But I am bound to say this, while I hold that language, and while I have done my best to restrain perhaps many among you from taking up what you would think to be a national and a justifiable position at the present time, I cannot but state that I think it is necessary that the members of the majority in the House of Lords should comprehend that we cannot always be fighting on this narrow ground. It is not to be expected that we should consent to acquiesce in a state of things in which irresponsible power is to be continually and obstinately pitted against power which is responsible."

Two days later when nearing home, and on the point of retiring into privacy for a time, Mr. Gladstone expressed himself still more explicitly on the relative position of the two Houses, but in a tone which, though his liegemen in the press and on the platform declared to be conciliatory, was very differently interpreted by his opponents and independent bystanders. According to these, the position taken up by the Chief of the Cabinet arose from the discovery he had made whilst in Scotland, that in the event of the Franchise Bill being sent up a second time to the Lords in the fashion it had been already presented to them, it would be again rejected; and that many peers who had previously voted in its favour would on a further trial of strength stand by their own order, and insist upon its co-ordinate right to an equal voice in a great constitutional change. By some of his own party Mr. Gladstone was being urged to meet this threat of revolt, or show of independence as it was variously termed, by the counter-threat of a large creation of new peers. It seemingly never occurred to those who were clamouring for the surrender of the House of Lords that the means they suggested to bring about this result was to recruit its ranks by those of their own party, who presumably might have shown special claims to an exercise of the prerogative of the Crown. In other words, the more prominent members of the Liberal party in the Commons and in the country were to be hoisted into the House of Lords in order to render that body less powerful. There was, however, little but

the wishes of those who looked and hoped for a peerage as a fitting reward for party services to support the belief that any such programme was ever seriously entertained by Mr. Gladstone. Nevertheless his speech at Carlisle (September 26) contemplated the surrender of the House of Lords as necessary to the preservation of harmony in the Legislature. "The House of Lords should simply endeavour to seek its safety and its welfare, as every one of us individually should endeavour to seek his safety and welfare, in the simple expedient of acting rightly, wisely, and courteously. Let the House of Lords do that which is just. In that course the House of Lords will find safety, and even dignity. It will be vindicated, and it will derive strength instead of weakness from this crisis, if it proves itself to be in possession of the courage necessary for doing right, and it will prove this—that it can act as one of its most lofty members acted—I mean the Archbishop of Canterbury—who said in the excellent speech he delivered on the second reading of the bill that it was the policy and the duty of the Church—and it is just as much the policy and the duty of the House of Lords—to trust the people. Their honour and consistency do not require them to reject in October, with enlarged knowledge, that which they rejected in July with contracted knowledge."

Mr. W. E. Forster speaking at Batley (September 27), whilst admitting the technical right of the Lords to vote as their consciences dictated, thought that the franchise question, being one on which the Commons and the people alone were interested, the Lords should waive their rights in the matter. At the same time, however, he maintained that neither inconvenience nor injustice would result from a General Election between the passing of the Franchise and Redistribution Bills, except to the wire-pullers whose calculations would be utterly thrown out by the introduction of so many unknown voters into the old constituencies. Mr. Chamberlain, speaking on the same day at King's Norton, admitted the issue before the nation to be a grave one; but he thought that the appeal to the reason of the peers was a hopeless appeal, since they had never yielded except upon compulsion. "I do not expect," he added, "that they will yield now, although Mr. Gladstone has spoken with much confidence. I confess that I find it impossible to believe that they will yield in the autumn. All I can say is that the issue will be with the people of this country."

Whatever may have been the feelings and intentions of the Conservative peers, they kept their own counsel; and in an article on "The Value of Redistribution," contributed by Lord Salisbury to the *National Review* (October), no reference was made to the onslaughts of which the peers had been the object. Lord Salisbury defined his objects in this important party manifesto to be, (1) to show by figures that the Conservatives had no cause for party reasons to dread enfranchisement coupled with fair redistribution; and (2) to show the general principles upon which

redistribution should be based. With regard to the former consideration, he believed that it could be shown by figures that, whereas extension without redistribution would aggravate the artificial and unjust disadvantages from which the Conservatives were suffering, a scheme which would reproduce at Westminster the proportion existing between Liberals and Conservatives throughout the country would not be unfavourable to the latter. To carry into effect the other portion of his programme Lord Salisbury protested against the idea of equal electoral districts.

"These would," he wrote, "in most communities not attain the object I desire to recommend. I doubt much whether any mechanism can be found to give anything like an exact copy in Parliament of the wishes of the people which does not make use of the principle of virtual representation. A sensible removal of the inequalities of representation must, no doubt, be one of the effects of any redistribution; and in remedying the inadequate representation under which some great districts of the kingdom suffer, it will mitigate a very real grievance. But a Reform Bill which does not tend to reproduce with fidelity the balance of opinion in the country wholly misses the main object at which it should be aimed. Even equal electoral districts may be so devised that they will produce injustice as great as the most grotesque anomalies could achieve."

After exposing the dangers of "misrepresenting" the people by exaggerating the existing system, Lord Salisbury suggested two hypotheses for consideration. First assuming that the householders in the county in each division would vote exactly as the householders in the towns of that division, a detailed analysis would lead to this conclusion:—

"The Liberal majority in Great Britain in 1880, setting aside university members, was 128. If household suffrage in counties had existed in 1880, with an absolutely fair apportionment of seats, even on an assumption so adverse to the Conservatives as that which I have made, the majority would only have been 93. In other words, the Conservatives would have been stronger on every division by 35. Now let us take the opposite hypothesis—that which is most favourable to the Conservatives. Let us assume that the new county voters will vote precisely on the pattern of those who have the county franchise now." The analysis shows a Conservative gain of 89.

Having answered two objections—that he had assumed too rigid a division between Liberal and Conservative, and that it was impracticable or difficult to obtain this perfectly fair redistribution—Lord Salisbury proceeded to show that the Conservatives had very cogent reasons for objecting to the omission of redistribution altogether. His conclusion was that the total loss to the Conservatives by enfranchisement without redistribution would be forty-seven seats, counting ninety-four votes on a division. And "they are already weaker by thirty-five than, according to the

numerical strength of their party in the country, they should be." This shows that, whatever the results at the polls of the future, and on any hypothesis, "a just solution of the question of redistribution means to the Conservatives a difference in their favour of some hundred votes in the House of Commons." The momentous significance of the question, then, was beyond dispute.

The argument of Lord Salisbury proceeded on the assumption that no system of distribution was completely just which did not, formally or virtually, give to the minority a representation corresponding to its actual weight. "A fair distribution," he concluded, "that is to say, a recognition according to their true strength, so far as possible, of all the interests in the country—is needed, not so much to decide the race for office as to maintain and indeed to restore that equable temperature which for many generations before 1860 was one of the distinctive features of our legislation."

No direct reply was given to these arguments by any of the Liberal leaders, and Lord Salisbury, on arriving at Glasgow (September 30), to undertake a campaign in the south-west of Scotland, limited himself in a preliminary speech to enforcing the views contained in his article. In reply, however, to a regret expressed by Mr. Gladstone in one of his recent speeches that Lord Beaconsfield was not living, for had he been at the head of the Conservative instead of "its actual reckless leader" the issue between the two Houses would not have arisen: "Mr. Gladstone," said Lord Salisbury, "is very fond of quoting Lord Beaconsfield's authority now that Lord Beaconsfield is no more. I remember the first thing that Mr. Gladstone said directly Lord Beaconsfield was dead; he said, 'that the opposition to the Irish Land Bill was the consequence of the death of Lord Beaconsfield.' I had in my possession at that moment a letter from Lord Beaconsfield, written a few months before his death, saying that nothing could have induced him to assent to the three F.'s, the principle of the Irish Land Act. Well, it is exactly the same in the present instance. Mr. Gladstone says that Lord Beaconsfield would have passed franchise without redistribution. Now, the subject was one that we frequently conversed upon during the year that preceded Lord Beaconsfield's death, because he always foresaw that the Liberals would try to play this trick. He knew that if the newly enfranchised voters were parcelled out into these old constituencies, which were not made for a uniform franchise but something totally different, the Liberals would have an illegitimate and unfair advantage, which would enable them to appear in Parliament with a strength wholly disproportioned to what they really hold in the country; and he always warned us that we must resist to the utmost with every means in our power the attempt to separate franchise from redistribution. I wish to say this because Mr. Gladstone finds it very convenient to appeal to Lord Beaconsfield's

authority when he is dead, although during Lord Beaconsfield's life he never agreed with him upon any single subject."

On the following day, in his speech to the representatives of the Conservative Associations of Scotland, Lord Salisbury dwelt upon the steady progress of Conservatism in England; where the Liberal party had been held together rather by the dexterity of its leader than by the harmony of opinion and objects. In the steadiness and stability of our institutions lay the best hope of the working-man; and a policy which filled all men's minds with disquiet and distrust was a dangerous thing for industry. Englishmen, pursued Lord Salisbury, would soon be brought to see that "the paths of national prosperity and national dishonour were not parallel," and they would recognise that the party which sustained the old constitution, under which England had grown great, was that to which the interests of complicated industry and commerce could be the most safely confided.

In his evening speech, Lord Salisbury dealt at length with the more burning question of the hour, the comparative honesty of the two parties—that of the Conservatives in declaring for the extended franchise, and that of the Liberals in evading the test of an appeal to the polling booths. "What," he asked, "would a Minister like Lord Palmerston or Lord Russell have done under the circumstances? They would have passed the Franchise Bill during the autumn session, they would have done that with ease, and when it was passed, or while it was passing, they would have introduced their Redistribution Bill. They would have sent each of those Bills as soon as they could up to the House of Lords. The House of Lords would have been able to deal with them together, and probably the whole controversy would have been solved in a single session. What is there to hinder a Minister from taking that course? What possible difference is there between passing a Redistribution Bill introduced this autumn, before next August, and passing a Bill after the Franchise Bill shall have been passed in an ordinary session? There is exactly the same amount of time at their disposal for passing a Redistribution Bill after this autumn session is concluded as there would be if they approached it under any ordinary circumstances. But, supposing that the distance from February to August is too short, it is not the law of the Medes and Persians that we should prorogue in August. There is nothing to prevent the Government prolonging the session as long as they like until the question is settled. Is it not evident that what they are anxious for is not that enfranchisement and redistribution should pass during the next session, but that they should get their dissolution with the old divisions. By that unfair device, being masters of the House of Commons, they will pass whatever Redistribution Bill the interests of their party require. It is evident enough that the Prime Minister in his excursion to Scotland has had something in view beyond the passing of an early Franchise and Redistribution Bill. He has

wanted to raise a quarrel to a cloud in which all other questions damaging to his Government might be lost."

This question was that of the proper function of the House of Lords. Mr. Gladstone's view at first was that a second chamber was a very good thing if it never contradicted the first chamber. To that view Lord Salisbury opposed his own, which was that the only use of a second chamber was to remedy the defects, mistakes, or whatever they might be of the first chamber. "If," said Lord Salisbury, "it is never to contradict the first chamber, it had better not exist at all. We say that both Houses of Parliament are independent of each other, but it is perfectly true that there may arise an occasion in which there is an insoluble problem, in which the two contradict each other, and it is essential that some decision should be arrived at. Who is to decide? Our answer is simple. The people are to decide. Unless the House of Commons acts in accordance with the will of the country, it is acting in departure from its true functions and mission, and if, upon good and sufficient grounds, especially when a Parliament has lasted many years, and is verging to its close, and is, in fact, almost within twelve months of its close—it ought not to complain if it is called upon to submit to the judgment of those to whose decision its power is entirely due."

Lord Salisbury then went on to argue that if freedom ran any danger, it was certainly not from any possible revival of the power of the aristocracy. It was in commencements of individual power that democratic freedom had invariably ended. "If you have any danger to fear to the free working of our institutions, it is from the growth of the power of the wire-puller, centered in the caucus under the direction of the Prime Minister—master of the House of Commons, master of the House of Lords, nay, yielding but apparent and simulated obedience to the orders of the Sovereign, gathering into his own hands every power in the State, and using them so that when the time of renewal of powers comes, his influence may be overwhelming and his powers may be renewed." When the Premier suggested that the Peers should discharge their duties with a view to retaining their powers, he (Lord Salisbury) could only say that such motives belonged to the degraded order of public morality. His belief was that the Peers would consent to exercise their powers only on the condition of absolute independence of every other power except that of the people of this country.

These expressions were variously interpreted by the public press, and even those papers representing Liberal opinion were unable to agree as to the intentions of the speaker. Thus, whilst the *Pall Mall Gazette* considered that Lord Salisbury had not closed the door to compromise, the *Spectator* was not less assured that he had nailed his colours to the mast, and would not surrender whatever happened. The *Times*, though admitting the speeches to be far more statesmanlike than many of Lord Salisbury's previous

utterances, thought that they showed a confusion in the uses of a second chamber. To act in concert with a minority in the representative chamber to secure a partisan object was a very different claim than that to exercise an inherent power of revision. The *Daily News* saw in the speech an intimation that the Conservative leader would repeat his previous policy, and hang up the Franchise Bill until an appeal had been made to the country. The *Daily Telegraph*, although unable to detect any change of resolution on Lord Salisbury's part, thought the solution of the difficulty, although improbable, was not altogether impossible.

But the Government soon found that they had to reckon not only with the direct arguments and attacks of their traditional opponents, but to furnish some sort of a reply to the appeals of their friends. The Duke of Argyll was one of the first to urge a reconciliation, urging that if even the Tories had been insincere about the franchise, they were so no longer. He did not believe that any peers had ever claimed the right of dictating when a dissolution should take place, but he held that when there was real doubt about public opinion, any second chamber must be able to defer its assent until after an appeal to the constituencies. Lord Bramwell followed the same side, calling upon the Government to produce its Redistribution Bill in the spirit of compromise. To this suggestion Mr. John Morley demurred, on the ground that it was asking the Government to reverse the decision of its own majority, which in the House of Commons had declared that redistribution should not accompany the franchise.

The reply of the Government was not long waited for. In the course of the week (October 4) Lord Hartington addressed at Rawtenstall a large meeting of the electors of North-East Lancashire. Claiming for Mr. Gladstone the will and the power above all others to pass a moderate and fair Redistribution Bill, he declared that his object was to apportion representation with reference to local circumstances, and to recognise the claims of numbers, both in town and country. He protested against the idea that a redistribution scheme could only be judged by minute calculations of the exact effect it would have upon the representation of minorities, or upon the fortunes of the Conservative party. Turning next to Lord Salisbury's speech, he went on to say, "I am not quite certain whether it is wise in the leader of the Conservative party to bring to the discussion the position of the House of Lords in the constitution of the country, and to the discussion of its relation to the House of Commons: I say I am not sure that it is wise to bring to the discussion of that question such remorseless logic as is brought to bear by Lord Salisbury. I am not quite certain that it is wise in the interests either of the House of Lords or the Conservative party to prove so conclusively that the House of Lords had no alternative but either to act as they have recently done or to cease to exist. I believe that the great majority of Lord Salisbury's

followers in the House of Lords have no desire whatever to cease to exist in their legislative capacity, and that if Lord Salisbury would only let them, they would be inclined to put a little of his logic into their pockets and to proceed, as they have proceeded before, in a spirit of somewhat fairer compromise in their relations with the other branch of the Legislature."

Before concluding he referred at length to the offers, real or supposed, of compromise discernible in the Glasgow speeches, and declared, though in veiled and cautious words, the willingness of the Government to meet any overtures which might be made to them.

"Lord Salisbury said Lord Russell or Lord Palmerston would have introduced in the autumn session—introduced and passed as soon as possible—a Franchise Bill and sent it to the House of Lords. Well, there is where we agree with Lord Salisbury; that is what we intend to do. Then he says, 'During the passage of this Bill or immediately after it they would have introduced a Redistribution Bill, and they would have sent that as soon as they could to the House of Lords.' Well, as to the introduction in the next session of a Redistribution Bill, I do not say that that would be an impossible course if we had any reason to know that such introduction would be accepted by the Conservative party in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords with a view to the more speedy, the more reasonable, and more satisfactory solution of the whole question. But what is the inducement that Lord Salisbury holds out to us? There follow, I regret to say, the fatal words, that we are to introduce and send up to the House of Lords as soon as possible the Redistribution Bill, in order that they may deal with both together. That is to say—they are both to be at the mercy of the majority of the House of Lords, or what is practically the same thing, of Lord Salisbury himself, until he is satisfied not only of the fairness and expediency of the Franchise Bill, but of the expediency to his party of the Redistribution Bill. That is no proposal for a compromise. It is a proposal for a surrender on the part of the Government and of the Liberal party. If Lord Salisbury had said that upon seeing our Redistribution Bill, and satisfying themselves that it was founded upon fair principles, that it was intended to secure a fair representation, irrespective of party, to the whole population, whether in towns or country—if he had said that upon satisfying themselves that the Bill was founded upon such principles, and without pledging themselves to every detail, that it was one which could be made the foundation of a settlement, they would proceed to take up and dispose of the Franchise Bill, and then join with us in the consideration of the Redistribution Bill, relying on the good faith of Ministers and upon the good sense of Parliament, there would in such a proposition as that have been some of the elements of a compromise. I am not in a position to say whether any compromise, or, if any, what compromise, could possibly be accepted; but I do say that a

proposal such as that would at all events have had within it the elements of a compromise which are absolutely absent from the proposal which Lord Salisbury now puts before the country."

No doubt was expressed in any quarter as to the import of these words, and although it was known that in the Cabinet itself certain members were firm in their opinion that the policy of the spring should be maintained, their opinion had to give way before that of their more "opportunistic" colleagues; and the *Daily Telegraph* went so far as to conclude that if Lord Hartington's compromise were accepted, the Lords would not be asked to vote the second reading of the Franchise Bill until the Redistribution Bill had been published. Any doubt whether Lord Hartington's suggestions were not merely personal to himself or to a party in the Cabinet of which he might have been supposed to be the leader was almost at once dispelled by Mr. Chamberlain himself. Speaking at Hanley (October 7) he expressed even more clearly than Lord Hartington had done the willingness of the Government to arrive at some amicable settlement, and at the same time he placed the alternative very plainly before the country.

"Unless we produce a Redistribution Bill which is satisfactory to him, Lord Salisbury says he will refuse to allow the extension bill to proceed, and he will endeavour to force a dissolution upon us. Now, gentlemen, to yield one inch—to yield one inch to such an arrogant proposal would not be a compromise; it would be a surrender. I think you know Mr. Gladstone well enough to believe that he is not the man to put his hand to the plough and then turn back. Well, then, is any amicable settlement at all possible? I do not say it is not. As long as Lord Salisbury maintains his present position any transaction with him is impossible. But there may be men in the Tory ranks who have followed with some reluctance, and who would not follow him at all if they could feel assured that the scheme of redistribution which we shall produce would be a fair scheme. They might desire to know that it would be a scheme which would proceed upon the ancient lines and upon the old precedents, and which would at any rate approximate to a state of things under which a more equal value than at present should be given to every voter. Well, I can only say that to such a desire as that it seems to me that every attention should be paid. I think that the Government may give every assurance and every information which is fairly required to satisfy such doubts, providing that it does not jeopardise our main purpose or do anything to imperil the success of the Franchise Bill. The prime condition must be that the Franchise Bill shall be passed. We cannot play with the rights of two millions of people. We cannot tamper with the hopes which have been excited. It is said that the Lords will not give way. Then I say neither will the people submit."

These speeches clearly left it to the Conservatives to take the next step. It is impossible to say how it would be made, or by

whom; but by an accident, or by a deliberate breach of confidence, they were suddenly placed in possession of the knowledge which their opponents felt it incumbent upon them to withhold. The day after Mr. Chamberlain's assurance that a very slight concession with regard to the Franchise Bill would insure the production of the redistribution proposals of the Government, a scheme appeared in the *Standard* which from its careful elaboration and minute statistical knowledge clearly showed its official origin. The authenticity was promptly denied in an official *communiqué*, which declared that the scheme had not even come before the Cabinet, but added somewhat illogically that it had been obtained by breach of official duty, and was one of several proposals made to the Government. In spite, however, of the virtuous silence of the *Times* and *Daily News*, which took no notice of a topic which all the country was eagerly discussing, the public believed the scheme to have a very solid official basis, and it was subsequently admitted that it reproduced almost accurately the proposals of a Ministerial Committee, composed of Lord Hartington, Sir Charles Dilke, and Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, to whom the work of drafting a scheme for formal acceptance by the Cabinet had been remitted.

The salient features of this scheme were as follows:—

1. Seventy-two boroughs with a population under 10,000 to be merged in the counties.
2. Forty boroughs with a population under 40,000, now returning two members, to lose one member each.
3. Fifty-four new members to be given to the counties.
4. Forty-seven seats to be given to the large towns, twenty-five of which were to be allotted to London, two to Dublin, three to Glasgow, and two to Edinburgh.
5. Seven new borough constituencies to be created in England, two with two members each, and five with one member each.
6. The three-cornered constituencies to be extinguished everywhere except in the City of London.
7. Where constituencies return four or six members they would be divided into wards, each returning two members.

It is unnecessary to refer by name to each of the constituencies affected by this scheme, but the results may be easily summarised. The disenfranchising clauses would at the outset tell more severely on the Liberals than on the Tories. Of the seventy-two boroughs with a population under 10,000, which would be disenfranchised under the Government scheme, thirty-eight of the sitting members were Liberals (including Home Rulers) and thirty-four Conservatives. In the forty constituencies of between 10,000 and 40,000, which would lose half their representatives, or, in the case of some of the corrupt constituencies, be merged in the surrounding counties, sixteen returned, at the last election, one Conservative and one Libera¹

each; nineteen returned two Liberals; only three returned two Conservatives, and two returned Home Rulers. Reckoning that both parties shared equally the loss in the so-called one and one constituencies, the partial disfranchisement of the forty constituencies would cost the Liberals twenty-seven seats, the Conservatives eleven, and the Home Rulers two. As the Liberals and Home Rulers lost four seats in the totally disfranchised boroughs, the net result of the disfranchising operations contemplated under this scheme would be that the Liberals and Home Rulers lose 67 seats as against 45 taken from the Conservatives.

To pass to the details of the scheme, it was proposed that in addition to the disfranchisement—whole or partial—of 105 boroughs, the rural boroughs of Crickslade, East Retford, New Shoreham, Aylesbury, and Wenlock being merged in their respective counties, twelve more seats would be made available, and to these were to be added two members each from the corrupt boroughs of Sandwich and Macclesfield. The counties of Hereford and Rutland were, moreover, each to surrender one of their representatives, so that the total number of seats at the disposal of the Government was raised to 110, as far as England was concerned. The proposed redistribution was practically a division of this number between the counties and the large towns. Additional members were allotted to the former in the following proportion:—

Lancashire	12	Devon	2	Sussex	2
York (West Riding)	11	Essex	2	York (North Riding)	2
Middlesex	5	Wilts	2	Hants	1
Durham	4	Gloucester	2	Herts	1
Cheshire	2	Kent	2	Moumouth	1
Cornwall	2	Notts	2	Somerset	1
		Total	56.		

The large towns were to be dealt with on the basis that all towns having a population of 400,000 should in future return six members. Where the population exceeded 300,000 and was under 420,000, two additional members would be given. The only exceptions being Manchester and Sheffield, which were to have one member in excess, and Wednesbury, which would have one below its strict proportion.

The boroughs which would have six or four members would be divided wards, two members for each, and they were as follows:—

Finsbury	6	Liverpool	6	Westminster	3
Lambeth	6	Manchester	6	Southwark	3
Marylebone	6	Chelsea	4	Greenwich	3
Hackney	6	Leeds	4	Bristol	3
Birmingham	6	Sheffield	4	Wednesbury	2
		Total	68.		

The following towns it was proposed to enfranchise in proportion to their population:—

West Ham	2	St. Helens	1	Barrow-in-Furness	1
Wandsworth	2	Aston Manor	1	Great Yarmouth	1
Croydon	1				
		Total	9.		

In the counties, the scheme proposed to adhere, except in a few cases, to the established system for two members of each division, but in the case of counties returning three members, Berks, Bucks, Dorset, &c., the county would be divided into three divisions, each returning one member. In Hants, Middlesex and Somerset, separate divisions returning one member each were to be constituted, and a somewhat similar treatment was suggested for Kent and Cornwall. In the densely populated districts of Lancashire and the West Riding of Yorkshire, the existing divisions would not be abolished, but they would be sub-divided into districts or wards, each returning a single member.

In Wales, of three seats gained by the merging of the Pembroke, Radnor, and Brecon boroughs, two would be allotted to Glamorganshire, and one to Carnarvonshire. Scotland it was proposed should receive an addition of eleven members, to be as equally as possible divided amongst the counties and boroughs: viz.

North Lanark . . .	3	Fife . . .	1	Edinburgh . . .	2
Renfrew . . .	1	Glasgow . . .	3	Aberdeen . . .	1

The application of this scheme to Ireland naturally attracted close scrutiny from all parties. Sixteen seats would be obtained by the total, and two from Waterford and Galway, by the partial disfranchisement of as many boroughs; as compensation for this effect of the Bill, it was proposed to allot to every county with a population of 300,000 and upwards, four additional members; to every county of 220,000, two additional members, and to give every county having more than 150,000 of population, one additional member, to be apportioned thus:—

Cork . . .	4	Galway . . .	2	Kerry . . .	1
Mayo . . .	2	Antrim . . .	2	Tyrone . . .	1
Down . . .	2	Donegal . . .	1	Tipperary . . .	1

These, with two additional members for the city of Dublin, would absorb the eighteen seats vacant by the disfranchisement of the smaller boroughs.

It was also foreseen in the sketch of the Bill as made public, that much of the value, as well as of the working of the measure, would depend upon the way in which the boundaries of the new divisions, the adjustment of the limits of borough and county constituencies, would be settled; and with this view it contained, according to the *Standard*, the names of the Commissioners who should inquire into and report on the boundaries, as soon as the scheme of redistribution had been agreed upon; Lieutenant-Colonel R. Owen Jones, head of the Ordnance Survey, Major Tulloch, R.E., and Lieutenant Hon. R. T. W. Pelham being so named.

It is hard to say whether the publication of their intentions (or at least their drift) was regarded altogether as a misfortune by the bulk of the supporters of the Government; whilst, so far as the Opposition were concerned, it removed all doubt as to the nature of the changes which the majority in the House of Commons would be called upon to support. With the exception of

the *Pall Mall Gazette*, which branded the scheme as a “twopenny-halfpenny measure,” none of the provincial organs, except the extreme Radical papers of Birmingham and Bradford, saw any cause for dissatisfaction. The principle of merging the boroughs into counties, instead of grouping them, was generally regarded as preferable; and although some papers would rather have seen all the voters of a district voting *en masse*, instead of being divided into wards, the hope that the scheme would be based on two-member constituencies rather than on one-member wards predominated; but on this point the *Spectator* disagreed with the majority of the Liberal organs, declaring that one-member wards alone reflected the variety of electors’ opinions.

The *Times*, after some days of hesitation, produced its own scheme, which it thought might be obtained by the application of three very simple and intelligible principles: first, that no borough with less than 12,000 inhabitants should be entitled to separate representation; secondly, that no borough with less than 50,000 inhabitants should be entitled to more than a single representative; and, thirdly, that no county area should be entitled to more than one representative in excess of the number obtained by dividing its total population by what it called the electoral unit—namely, 54,000. If, for instance, a county area contained 220,000 inhabitants in all, and there was one borough in it entitled to separate representation, the county proper would have four members; if there were two such boroughs, the county proper would have only three members, and so on in each case. Special and exceptional cases would call for special and exceptional treatment. “The real problem turned less upon the exact apportionment of representation to population than upon the equitable separation of county and borough constituencies.”

The Government, moreover, was destined to find that their moderate proposals, designed to soften the perfunctory objections of the Opposition, were not quite palatable to some of their own supporters. The Radicals soon began to declare that they had been sacrificed by the Whigs to the Conservatives, and that too great tenderness had been shown to the latter, whilst the harshest arithmetical justice had been meted out to the Liberals; and as time went on, the divergence between the advanced and rearward guards of the party became more and more pronounced. Nevertheless, the spirit of compromise was in the air. The first hint came from the north. During his stay in Aberdeenshire it was not surprising that Mr. Gladstone should pay a visit to the Queen at Balmoral; nor when followed thither, after a short interval, by the Duke of Richmond, was public attention excited. A few days later, however, it was understood that Lord Salisbury and Lord Cairns had planned a joint visit to the Duke; and the Conservative chiefs thus assembled in conclave were able to discuss the redistribution scheme revealed by the *Standard*, although their original intention might have been only to discuss the action of

the House of Lords in the ensuing session. Meanwhile, however, whatever their ultimate intentions may have been, there were few outward signs of any approach towards an understanding. Sir William Harcourt, addressing his constituents at Derby (October 9), devoted nearly the whole of his long speech to vituperation of Lord Salisbury, who retorted at Kelso (October 11) that the Home Secretary reduced English political controversy to an American level. Lord Salisbury, however, on the same occasion, took the opportunity of recognising the tone of conciliation in which Lord Hartington's speech at Rawtenstall had been conceived: although he saw in it no definite proposal which could bring the controversy to a close; whilst Mr. Chamberlain's subsequent speech was "more violent and subversive against the institutions of the country than any Minister had yet employed." "In fact," added Lord Salisbury, "the only suggestion which seemed to fall from Lord Hartington—but it was wrapped in perhapses and ifs, and depended on a number of contingencies as though it came from a man who was pretty sure he should be disavowed—the only suggestion he made was that, if the Government would introduce a fair Redistribution Bill, then the House of Lords would be so charmed with it that they would pass the Franchise Bill without requiring to know more about the fate of the Redistribution Bill. Well, that is a very amiable picture, but it hardly seems to me like business. A bill is a very interesting study, but until it has passed the House in which it is introduced it is nothing but an interesting study—it has no value. I think we shall want something more than that. I think that when this fair and equitable Redistribution Bill is being introduced we shall ask that the natural results shall follow, and that a fair electoral bill shall be also passed; and when it is passed and sent up to the House of Lords I have no doubt there will be no difficulty whatever in disposing of both Bills to the satisfaction of the country."

As for the redistribution scheme as revealed, Lord Salisbury regarded it as "effacing those rural populations which suffer too much disadvantage under the present system, and are not represented at all in comparison to their numbers." Referring to the possible deadlock which might be the only outcome of the winter Session, Lord Salisbury conveyed to most minds the idea that, with his consent, the Peers would never yield. "Allow me to remind you," he said, "what the precise contention of the House of Lords is. It is that no Franchise Bill of this magnitude can be equitable or safe unless it is accompanied by a fair Redistribution Bill; and that one of these measures must not come into operative legal effect without the other. This I take to be the contention of the House of Lords. . . . I do not think the House of Lords will recede from it, and I am quite sure that they ought not to do so. . . . We are asked to give the Government a blank cheque, and in exchange for it they will give us a cheque without signature." The interpretation put on these words was that, unless

the House of Commons endorsed a fair Redistribution Bill, Lord Salisbury would not advise the Lords to pass the Franchise Bill.

Almost at the same time Lord Hartington was explaining to a large Liberal audience at Chatsworth the meaning of the Conservative leaders in asking to be allowed to deal with the two Bills together. "That is to say, gentlemen, they want to make a condition of passing the Franchise Bill—which we wish for, and they say they wish for—that they shall have a Redistribution Bill at their mercy and at their disposal, and that until we assent to their conditions of that bill we shall have neither franchise nor redistribution. I will not go back. I can find no better expression than that which has been so often used in this country in this controversy—that is, the pistol to our heads. But the pistol is a pistol not aimed at the head of the Conservative party by the Liberal Government, but it is a pistol which Lord Salisbury places at the head of the Government and at the head of the Liberal party when he says, 'Give us a Redistribution Bill which shall be to the advantage of the Tory party, or you shall have no Franchise Bill.'"

Lord Hartington further went on to admit the authenticity of the scheme published by the *Standard*, and although the Cabinet was not definitely committed to its principle or its details, he regarded it as a fair scheme, regardless of party consideration. In conclusion he declared that he was not afraid the House of Lords would prevail in the contest, or that they would be overcome by any revolutionary process. "We are near a deadlock, a Parliamentary deadlock, but I do not believe it will be reached. A contest between the House of Lords and the House of Commons is not an equal contest. The House of Commons, strong in its representative character, strong in the support of the great masses of the people, manifested more and more clearly from day to day, strong in the undivided and indisputable control it possesses over the resources of the country, is more than a match for its opponents in this contest. The resources of our Constitution are not exhausted, and it is my conviction that, however near we may be to a Parliamentary deadlock, that deadlock will be avoided. Although that is my conviction—and, indeed, because it is my conviction—I am not the less anxious that the House of Lords should yield without loss of honour or of dignity; not the less anxious that they should yield without further loss of temper; of time which is precious to the nation; above all, without further risking disturbance of our constitutional institution, of which this country has long been, and, I believe, ever will remain proud."

Sir William Harcourt followed very much the same line of argument, but in stronger language, telling his hearers that they were met to reject by their voices "the violent, the unjust pretensions of the House of Lords to subvert the free Constitution of this country." Regardless of all Lord Salisbury's denials, he

repeated that the House of Lords claimed to be the supreme authority to determine the destinies of the nation. Mr. Herbert Gladstone went even a step further than the Home Secretary, declaring that if the Lords forced a dissolution the Government could "dissolve upon the question as to whether the House of Lords had a right to dictate a dissolution and as to whether an irresponsible body of hereditary legislators were entitled to interfere with the Government of the people."

These autumn "picnics," however, were not destined to come to a close without a display of intolerance of the majority in a district where it might have been thought that the Conservatives would have been permitted to have expressed their views without any of the alarm begotten of the fear of contagion. Birmingham, which for long had been regarded as the stronghold of Radicalism, the author and centre of the Caucus system, had on previous occasions given a good-humoured welcome to Sir S. Northcote and Lord R. Churchill, and in the earlier part of the summer the electors had listened with attention to Lord Salisbury and others. At a meeting, however, called in Aston Park (October 13) to which entrance was only by tickets, a section of the Liberals thought fit to call a meeting of their own body outside the park gates, and after a very short time the wall which separated the two bodies was scaled or pulled down, and the rival assemblies found themselves in collision. A certain amount of damage was done to the chairs and tables and flower-beds. The Conservative speakers were unable to make themselves heard, and the Liberal party got the credit of, after finding an attempt to use false tickets unsuccessful, having resorted to violence in order to silence their political opponents. At a subsequent meeting Sir S. Northcote expressed his belief that there was an advance on the part of the Government to bring about a settlement of the question. For his own part he declared that the settlement should be made on clear lines and in both Houses of Parliament. The agitation as conducted by the Radicals so far was, he contended, really a covert attack on the House of Lords, and he appealed to those interested in maintaining the institutions of the country to say whether they would like to see that Chamber abolished.

On the same evening, Mr. Fawcett, addressing his constituents at Hackney, adopted a tone very different from that which marked the majority of speeches on both sides. He expressed his hope and belief that the counsels of common sense, prudence and patriotism would yet prevail, and that the difficulties in the way of passing the Franchise Bill would be surmounted. He urged, therefore, that everything should be done to lessen, not to intensify, the bitterness of party spirit, and drew attention to the wide range of subjects in the field of useful legislation, which must be postponed amid the angry feelings evoked by a prolonged constitutional crisis. Sir Charles Dilke, at Oldham (October 14), and at Manchester (October 15) seemed, however, to sympathise but little

with his colleague's views on this point, for in each case his speeches were chiefly directed to the past misdeeds of the Tory party, and the hindrances which the House of Lords placed in the way of legislation. At Oldham, however, he said that if the Tories would come forward with a fair and reasonable proposal of redistribution, the Government were only too anxious to meet them; but his belief was that the object of the Lords was not to pass but to defeat the Bill. He admitted that the Lords were popular, but if they persisted in rejecting the Franchise Bill in November a moral earthquake was imminent. The conflict engaged would be found ultimately to include issues which those who raised it would live to regret. At Manchester, Sir C. Dilke expressed his belief that there had been far too much compromise already, that he had not the least doubt as to the issue of the conflict which the Lords had so wantonly provoked. To these accusations Sir S. Northcote, who, with Lord R. Churchill, had gone on from Birmingham to Liverpool (October 17), made no direct reply, only repeating his view that the agitation against the House of Lords had been got up for ulterior ends. They seemed, however, to have been agreed in purpose as to the rejection of the compromise offered by the Government; and insisted upon hanging up the Franchise Bill until they could "handle" the Redistribution Bill also. Both Lord Salisbury and Lord R. Churchill described the Draft Scheme published by the *Standard* as unfair and gerrymandering, whilst Sir S. Northcote let fall a hint at Liverpool that "the House of Commons would do their duty in discussing the Bill." The Liberal leaders were not slow in following suit, for Mr. Chamberlain, adopting the tone of Sir C. Dilke, told an enthusiastic meeting at Newtown (Montgomeryshire), (October 18) that Lord Salisbury had baffled the peacemakers and rendered a compromise on the Franchise question hopeless; and if the House of Commons were to yield to the demand of the Peers, it would deserve the contempt of all the world. He believed that the time had nearly come when an end must be brought to the system under which the Liberals lived in sufferance upon the Tory peers. He charged Lords Salisbury and R. Churchill as having conspicuously incited the people to disorder and violence; whilst he described the proceedings at Birmingham as the act of working-men who merely pulled off the coping of a wall in order to attend a meeting to which they had been invited. What, however, chiefly embittered Mr. Chamberlain was a charge brought by Lord R. Churchill against the municipality of Birmingham that it made politics a test in choosing its officers. At Denbigh, in the presence of a still larger meeting, Mr. Chamberlain drew in strong colours the relative position of the privileged and the poorer classes, likening the attitude of the House of Lords on the Franchise Bill to that of a theatre manager, who should keep waiting outside the crowds—who had paid their entrance—until he had decided where he would assign them places. In reply to Sir S. Northcote's charge

of having a spite against the House of Lords, he added: "I have always thought it a very picturesque institution, attractive from its connection with the history of our country. I have no desire to see a dull uniformity of social life, and I am thankful rather than otherwise to gentlemen who will take the trouble of wearing robes and coronets, and who will keep up a certain state and splendour which it is very pleasing to look upon. They are ancient monuments, and I, for one, should be very sorry to deface them. But I cannot admit that we can build upon these interesting ruins the foundations of our Government. I cannot allow that these antiquities should control the destinies of a free Empire." He commented at some length on a remarkable statement made by Lord Salisbury who wished we could institute an American Senate in this country; declaring it to be the most revolutionary utterance that had ever fallen from a Conservative statesman. If, as it seemed to indicate, Lord Salisbury was willing to abandon hereditary rights as a condition for a Second Chamber, then, said Mr. Chamberlain, the Tory Peer and Radical Commoner were agreed.

The last word of the recess, however, as had the first, lay with the Conservatives. On the eve of the meeting of Parliament, Lord Salisbury delivered at Dumfries (October 22) a speech which, whilst giving no absolute hope of a compromise, did not shut the door against it so definitely as had some of the previous speeches of his own party. Referring to Lord Hartington's declaration that the leverage of an accepted and passed Franchise Bill was necessary to lift a Redistribution Bill over the obstacles which would be thrown in its way, he compared it to the nurse's method of holding a refractory baby's nose in order to make it open its mouth to swallow unpleasant medicine. The House of Lords, said Lord Salisbury, did not contend for the constitutional right of forcing a dissolution; but for that of refusing a measure, which, apart from a special scheme of redistribution, it did not approve, until the country should have ratified the piece-work plan of the Government. A dissolution, he believed, would come soon enough, and the Lords were quite willing to wait for it.

Beyond the Franchise Bill and the attitude of the House of Lords public attention strayed but little. The interest in the state of the Navy, which the *Pall Mall Gazette* attempted in a series of articles to awaken, was for a long time confined to professional men; and although the conclusion at which the majority of the writers on the subject arrived was that our naval supremacy had ceased to exist, very few public speakers attempted to arouse their audiences by referring to the matter. The points chiefly dwelt upon were the relative strength, present and immediately future, of the French and English navies; the inadequate provision made for the defence of our mercantile marine, of our coaling and telegraph stations, and of our home ports; the want of docks or refitting stations abroad; the failing supply of sailors, and the deficiency of torpedo boats. With a growth since 1870

of forty per cent. in trade and wealth, and thirty per cent. in shipping, as well as an enormous extension in the area of our possessions, we were spending less on the Navy than we spent in 1868. In the meantime the expenditure of other countries, and especially of France, had greatly increased. In the four years ending 1878-9, the aggregate excess of the English ship-building vote over that of France was more than eight millions; in the six years ending 1884-5 it was less than two and a quarter millions. The guns with which our ships were armed were inferior, both in weight and power, to those of France. On the China station we were immeasurably weaker than France. On the Pacific station than either Chili or Brazil. There were only twenty-four fast unarmoured ships to protect 19,000 merchantmen. More than half our coaling stations were open to the sudden attack of a single hostile ship, and the telegraph between England and Australia was unprotected at the one point where it comes to the surface. Some of our most important home ports could be destroyed immediately upon war being declared—or on the new French doctrine of reprisals without war being declared. The French had more sailors and a far larger naval reserve. At the end of the year our twenty-four first-class torpedo boats would be scattered all over the world, while France would have fifty, Italy forty-three, and Germany was building seventy, carrying torpedoes fitted with a new and effective steering apparatus, of which the secret was only known to the German Admiralty.

Although not wholly endorsing the charges brought against the Admiralty, Mr. W. H. Smith, an ex-First Lord, wrote to the *Times* renewing the appeal he had made during the Session for an independent committee to report upon the facts. This suggestion, however, received but little support; the official apologists had persistently maintained that the Navy was never in a more satisfactory condition and that the resources at their command were fully equal to the requirements of the service. A committee therefore, whilst bringing a censure upon the Government, would further, if it came to any agreement, relieve the Executive of the responsibility which properly belonged to it. A little later (October 1), Mr. W. H. Smith, in a speech at Newport, adopted a more independent course of criticism. Having personally seen what was being done in other countries, he came to the conclusion that the English naval force was inadequate to the duties it had to perform. In times of perfect peace, the mere police duties thrown upon it occupied nearly all its available ships; and there would certainly be none which could be spared to protect our merchant navy or insure the regular importation of food. Sir William Armstrong urged the need of many fast, light-armed, or even unarmoured cruisers; and Sir E. J. Reed, another practical authority, took the opposite view, but insisted that the condition of the Navy was a question of economy, which influenced all parties alike when they were in office.

In the conduct of Egyptian affairs the Government recovered some of their lost credit, and hopes were entertained that they had adopted a definite line of policy, and were determined to hold to their own views, regardless of foreign intrigues and attacks. The departure of Lord Wolseley for the Soudan and Lord Northbrook's temporary suspension of the Law of Liquidation were almost contemporaneous; and both found general support in this country. The outcry raised by France against the latter act was so loud and sustained that the Government saw fit not to prolong the situation beyond the original period of six weeks; and by this concession to the bondholders they again lost much of the support they had previously obtained. Lord Wolseley's cautious advance was at the same time set down to the instructions of the Government, which hoped that some unforeseen event might render unnecessary the costly and dangerous advance into a trackless and unknown desert. In South Africa, the tardy despatch of Sir Charles Warren to Bechuanaland was declared by the Opposition to be another instance of "Too late," which had been the ever-recurring reproach to the Cabinet of Best Intentions.

Some slight change in the arrangement of offices was made just prior to the meeting of Parliament; noteworthy especially as it seemed to recognise the power claimed by the Nationalists in moulding the decisions of the Cabinet. Mr. G. Trevelyan, who had accepted the office of Chief Secretary for Ireland at a perilous juncture, had by his firmness and decision of purpose soon rendered himself obnoxious to the Home Rule party; and for months they spared no effort to force him to resign his thankless office. Every miscarriage of justice, the misdeeds of every Castle official, the infliction of every sentence pronounced by the judges were regarded as evidence of his personal ill will against the nation whose affairs he had been sent to administer. Wearied out by such persistent misrepresentations, it was not surprising he showed as much eagerness to be quit of his office as the Irish members displayed in their attempts to drive him from it. Mr. Dodson, who had for some short time held the sinecure Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster, made way for Mr. Trevelyan, who was rewarded by a seat in the Cabinet; and Mr. Campbell Bannerman, who at the War Office and Admiralty successively had displayed considerable tact as well as an aptitude for administration, was prevailed upon to accept the dangerous succession open by Mr. Trevelyan's withdrawal. The vacancy thus created at the Admiralty enabled Mr. Gladstone to recruit the Radical section of his administration by the addition of Mr. Caine, a Liverpool shipowner, who had been Mr. Dodson's colleague in the representation of Scarborough, and was chiefly known for his ardent advocacy of the temperance cause in Parliament.

CHAPTER VII.

THE WINTER SESSION.

The Meeting of Parliament—Debate on the Address—The Government Programme—State of Ireland—Mr. Chamberlain and the Birmingham Riots—South Africa—The Franchise Bill in the Commons—Mr. E. Stanhope's Amendment—The Bill sent to the Lords—Rumour of Compromise—The Negotiations—Their Issue—The Redistribution Bill introduced—Mr. Courtney's Resignation—The Franchise Bill passed—Egyptian Affairs—Increase of Income Tax—State of the Navy—General Summary.

WHEN Parliament assembled (October 23) for the winter session, which the obstinacy of the Lords according to one party, or the wilfulness of the Government as others declared, had made necessary, there were few who anticipated any practical results from its labours. A spirit of compromise was in the air, but the conditions under which compromise was possible were so ill-defined, personal feelings were supposed, rightly or wrongly, to operate so strongly on political issues, that there seemed little ground in common between the opponents for the starting-point even of an understanding. The Conservatives, it is true, had admitted the extension of the franchise to be inevitable; but, although they had accepted the principle, they were decided in refusing its application, except under conditions which the Liberals pronounced impossible or preposterous. Outside Parliament, the more impartial were inquiring who would bring the first stone to build the bridge over which the Peers were to retreat with honour; and there was some hope that Mr. Gladstone, in the House of Commons, would take the first opportunity of showing the magnanimity of the party of which he was the leader, and thereby avert the conflict which he deprecated so strongly. The country had, it must be allowed, to some extent been aroused, thanks to the energy of the "wandering minstrels" of politics, who throughout the recess had been performing on every platform between Penzance and Aberdeen; and the publication of a Redistribution scheme, which had never been satisfactorily disavowed, had quickened the interests of those whom the measure, if carried, would affect. But of enthusiasm for the new reforms there was not more enthusiasm among the unenfranchised than there was of violent dislike amongst those who were about to be deprived of their direct representation. Judging from party meetings, the balance of numbers had been enormously in favour of the Liberals, who claimed to have held 1,277 public gatherings in England, and 235 in Scotland, against 184 in the former, and 11 in the latter country, held in support of the House of Lords. The attendance at these meetings varied considerably, for which one set of estimates gave three millions and a half for the Liberals, and 300,000 only to the

Conservatives. Another calculation raised the numbers of the latter to 671,000, and reduced those of the Liberals less than one million and a half. According, however, to either reading of the informal plébiscite, the Ministry had ample reason for believing their programme of pressing forward the Franchise Bill to be in accordance with the wishes of the majority, and that they would be supported against their opponents in any appeal which might be forced upon them.

The Queen's speech, which was delivered by commission, was remarkable chiefly for its brevity, the Government adhering to its original intention of making the session a short one, and limited to the discussion of the single subject of the franchise. It ran as follows:—

"My Lords and Gentlemen,

"I have brought you together after a recess unusually short, in order that you may be enabled at once to give your further consideration to the great subject of the representation of the people in Parliament.

"I continue to maintain relations of amity with all Foreign Powers.

"The information received from the Soudan includes painful uncertainties; but the energy, courage, and resource conspicuously displayed by General Gordon in the successful defence of Khartoum deserve my warm recognition.

"The advance of my troops to Dongola has for its object the rescue and security of that gallant officer, and of those who have so faithfully co-operated with him.

"In Egypt itself I am using my best endeavours to promote further improvement; and I have given my support to the Egyptian Government in the difficult financial position in which it has been left through the failure of the recent Conference.

"I have to regret that circumstances have occurred on the south-western frontier of the Transvaal which demand my vigilant attention. In conjunction with the Government of the Cape Colony, I am engaged in considering the means which may be required to secure the faithful observance of the Convention of the present year.

"Papers on this subject will be presented to you at an early date.

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons,

"The operations in the Soudan will render it necessary to ask from you a further pecuniary provision.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,

"The Bill for the extension of the Parliamentary Franchise will at once be introduced.

"In conclusion, I humbly and most anxiously trust that the blessing of Almighty God may attend upon your labours."

In the House of Lords the Address was moved by Lord Belper, and seconded by Lord Lawrence, who strongly urged their

lordships to pass the Franchise Bill, and to accept the assurance of the Government that in the Redistribution Bill in committee, advantage would be taken of the Conservative party. Lord Salisbury at once rose, and after criticising with skill the "notorious felicity of grammar" which seemed always to attach to the inspired productions of the royal pen, he distinctly challenged the assertion that there was any improvement in the state of affairs in Egypt. As to the frontier of the Transvaal demanding the vigilant attention of the Government, he should have understood their saying it demanded their strong intervention. "But the ordinary attitude of the Colonial Office is a *nirvana*, a kind of absorption in itself, a contemplation of its own perfections, a sleep from which it is only aroused by circumstances of an extraordinary character, and from which it emerges with great reluctance and regret." Touching briefly on the mode in which a Minister of the Crown (Mr. Chamberlain) assisted in keeping the Queen's peace, Lord Salisbury expressed in the following terms his attitude towards the Reform question:—

"My Lords, the Speech introduces the question of the franchise in the following words:—'You will be enabled to give your calm consideration to the great subject of the representation of the people.' Last session the Franchise Bill was introduced simply as 'an enlargement of the occupation franchise.' I hope there is meaning and significance in the difference of these two expressions. I am not going to express my opinion upon the dispute which prevails. My opinion will be found expressed very accurately in the resolution adopted by your Lordships in July last. I have nothing to alter in the opinion there expressed. But this statement in the Speech from the Throne leads me to the belief that we have made converts; that the Government, seeing that the representation of the people is really a great subject, that it cannot be dealt with in any imperfect and half-hearted mutilated fashion, do understand the importance of introducing both a Franchise Bill and a Redistribution Bill, and that they intend to press them forward without any artificial obstacles or interruptions—with all the rapidity that may be."

Lord Granville, in reply, defended the Colonial Office on the ground that the Government was attempting to discharge the liabilities incurred by their predecessors in South Africa and elsewhere; and with regard to the attack of Mr. Chamberlain, he declined to admit the responsibility of the Cabinet for words used by any one of its members; and reminded Lord Salisbury that the use of strong language was not confined to Radical platforms. After a few questions from Lord Carnarvon, respecting the action of the Government in South Africa, the Duke of Argyll declared that inasmuch as both sides were agreed upon the Franchise question, there was no reason that a Redistribution Bill should not be passed; and thus the danger of a collision between the two Houses and a constitutional deadlock might with a little

mutual concession be avoided. The Peers then adjourned for ten days.

In the House of Commons, the Address having been moved by Mr. S. Howard and seconded by Mr. Summers, Sir S. Northcote, on behalf of his party, expressed his satisfaction that a broader view of the Reform question was apparently contemplated in the Royal Speech, and an intention to deal with it in a more comprehensive spirit than in the previous session. While promising a candid consideration to a measure conceived in this spirit, he warned the Government that the Opposition could not depart from their view that the question should be dealt with essentially as a whole, and that both parts should be considered together. Commenting on the other paragraphs, he complained that no papers were promised in regard to Egypt, and asked for some definite and early information as to the policy of the Government in regard to Khartoum. He also remarked on the omission from the Speech of all mention of the Congo Conference.

Mr. Gladstone, in reply to this, said that the subject had not then arrived at the stage at which a communication could be made to Parliament, but papers would be laid on the table in a few days which, he believed, would be found satisfactory. Papers would also be at once produced bringing down Egyptian affairs to the end of September, and Lord Northbrook having started home from Alexandria, his recommendations would shortly be laid before the Government, and the result of them would be communicated to Parliament at the earliest practicable moment. As to Khartoum, there was no intention to depart from their former policy. Acknowledging the moderation and gentleness of Sir S. Northcote's tone in reference to the Reform question, and expressing the opinion that it was the duty of all to follow his example, he feared that his claim to have the two branches of the subject considered together could not be accepted without discredit and dishonour. The real question now was which majority was to prevail, that in the Lords or that in the Commons? The intention of the Government was that the majority in the Commons should prevail, and they could not consent to surrender at discretion and to pass under the Caudine Forks. The demand of the Opposition, therefore, was inadmissible. The object of the present meeting of Parliament was not to re-discuss the Franchise Bill, which he deprecated, but to afford the House of Lords another opportunity of considering it with the evidence of the last two months before their eyes? If this Bill were a second time set aside, would it be possible, he asked, to confine the controversy to Parliamentary reform? He had done his best to limit the controversy, and he would persevere in that course, but he appealed earnestly to the leaders of the Opposition to beware lest they placed in conjunction with Parliamentary reform the much more critical question of an organic reform of the House of Lords.

The speakers who followed on the Conservative side drew from Mr. Gladstone's speech that he would be content with nothing less than a complete surrender on the part of the Lords; and the only speaker from the Liberal side, Lord E. Fitzmaurice, limited himself to defending the policy of his department in Egypt and on the Congo. The Address might have, therefore, been agreed to without further delay, had not the Irish members determined to arraign the conduct of the judge and jury before whom the Maamtrasna murder case had been tried; and to charge the Crown Officials with suppressing evidence in favour of the prisoners. The question, once opened, was fruitful in numerous adjournments, and caused the debate on the Address to be protracted in accordance with the precedents of the few previous years. The Maamtrasna murders were among the most horrible of the many horrible crimes that had been committed in Ireland for many years. A whole family named Joyce, men, women, and children, were attacked and done to death, with the exception of one young boy, who, though dangerously wounded, ultimately recovered, in the night between August 17 and 18, 1882. Ten men were arrested for the crime on the evidence of three witnesses who professed to have followed the murderers and seen them enter the house in which the crime was committed. The evidence of these three witnesses was corroborated at the trial by two of the prisoners, Anthony Philbin and Thomas Casey, who turned approvers, and whose evidence was accepted by the Crown. After three successive trials three of the prisoners were condemned and subsequently executed, and the remaining five having pleaded guilty were also sentenced to death, though their sentence was subsequently commuted to penal servitude for life. Of the three men executed, Patrick Joyce, Patrick Casey, and Myles Joyce, the third was alleged to have been declared innocent by the other two in their dying depositions. The sentences were approved in Ireland at the time, and much satisfaction was expressed in all quarters at the fact that Irish juries had at length been found ready to convict on adequate and conclusive evidence. But in the course of the summer the whole matter was reopened by the circumstance that Thomas Casey—who a few weeks previously had repeated his former evidence, not as a witness for the Crown, but on behalf of the claimants for compensation in respect of the murder—came forward and volunteered a statement “that he had been induced under pain of capital punishment to swear away the life of Myles Joyce who had been executed in Galway. He declared that Myles Joyce was perfectly innocent, that he (Casey) offered to give information against the guilty parties, and was told by the official that unless he swore against Myles Joyce, though innocent, he himself would surely be hanged; that he got twenty minutes' deliberation, and then from terror of death swore as had been suggested to him.” This statement of Casey's allegations was transmitted by the Archbishop of Tuam to the Lord

Lieutenant. In response to an appeal of the Archbishop contained in the same letter, and in fulfilment of a pledge given by Lord Hartington in the House of Commons, Lord Spencer instituted a careful and searching inquiry into the allegations made by Casey, with a view to testing their truth in connection with the whole circumstances of the trial, and the subsequent history of the witness himself; and as a result of this investigation, the nature and details of which were recorded in a memorandum subsequently forwarded to the Archbishop, the Lord Lieutenant arrived, in his own words, "at a clear conclusion that the verdict and the sentence were right and just."

With this conclusion the Irish Nationalist party professed themselves entirely dissatisfied, and they determined to try the case afresh before the House of Commons. The issue raised by Mr. Harrington was not so much whether Casey's original or his revised version of the facts was true, as whether the assertion of the compulsion under which Casey made his confession was worthy of credence. The accusation against the officials of the Irish Government, which Mr. Harrington based on the last allegations made by Casey, was not that they committed an error in accepting the evidence originally laid before them, but that they one and all had entered into a conspiracy in order to secure the conviction of innocent men. "What he had to rely upon," said Mr. Harrington, "in putting his case before the House, was the guilt of the officials in Ireland from the Crown Solicitor to the Lord Lieutenant, because they, with a full knowledge of the facts before their minds, had proceeded to endeavour to hang ten innocent men upon evidence which they knew to be false." To support such a belief there was nothing, as Mr. Trevelyan affirmed, but the evidence of a thrice-perjured man; and if there were any valid ground for reopening a judicial inquiry into the facts, a Government that allowed any political considerations whatever to affect its decision would be guilty, Mr. Trevelyan said, of the greatest iniquity. But in default of such valid ground, clear, conclusive, and irresistible, to grant an inquiry in obedience to interested clamour would be little short of a death-blow to the authority of the Executive in Ireland.

It was probably for this very reason that the motion received the almost united support of the Nationalist party. Mr. Parnell, indeed, in conjunction with Mr. C. Russell and Mr. McCarthy, strove, though somewhat hopelessly, to extenuate the virulence with which the party attacked the Lord Lieutenant and his secretary, and when at length a division was taken (219 against 48) the "Fourth" party and three English Radicals were found in the minority.

But the course of the debate had been hindered by another interlude. On the second night of the session (October 24), in reply to a question put by Sir F. Milner relating to the Aston Park disturbances, Mr. Chamberlain stated that the only persons guilty

of disgraceful conduct were the roughs hired as "chuckers-out" by the Tory party. Lord R. Churchill thereupon inquired if Mr. Chamberlain intended to take an early opportunity of replying to the charge made on the previous evening by Sir H. Drummond Wolff respecting his (Mr. Chamberlain's) share in the matter. To this the President of the Board of Trade replied that he would answer any accusations against himself or his constituents, but he had not thought it necessary to answer Sir H. Wolff in the previous debate, as he regarded him as acting as Lord Randolph's "jackal." Lord R. Churchill appealed to the Chair whether this language was parliamentary. To this the Speaker replied that the description was not to be taken literally, and looking at it as a figurative expression he did not regard it as transgressing any rule.

The discussion then dropped, but shortly afterwards Lord R. Churchill gave notice of his intention of moving an amendment on the Address. This took the form of a vote of censure (October 30) on Mr. Chamberlain for speeches which, he contended, encouraged interference with freedom of discussion, and incited to riot and disorder. His apology for bringing the matter under the notice of the House was the enormous amount of attention which the Aston riots had attracted, and the manifest fact that when the Prime Minister pronounced his emphatic condemnation of a resort to violence he had not read Mr. Chamberlain's speeches. He accused Mr. Chamberlain of a systematic attempt to incite the people to riot and disorder, and he charged him with moral complicity in all the scenes of violence which had occurred during the recess. In support of these charges Lord Randolph Churchill quoted numerous extracts from Mr. Chamberlain's speeches at Birmingham, Hanley, and Newtown, in which he contended he had stimulated the people of Birmingham to imitate the doings of their fathers in 1832, gloried at what had happened in consequence at Aston, and encouraged others to do the same. No Minister of the Crown, he asserted, had ever used language approaching it, and Irish members had been committed to prison for language much less strong. As to the riot at Aston, he asserted that Mr. Chamberlain was cognizant of the counter demonstration, and of what it was intended to result in; that he might have prevented the riot if he had chosen, but that he had refrained from doing it.

Mr. Chamberlain, in reply, remarked that the charges now made were much less serious than those advanced by the same speaker against him at Birmingham. To these he replied in detail, producing evidence to rebut the accusation of forged tickets, premeditated disturbance, and organised interruption, and gave a flat denial to the assertion that he had any personal complicity. He did not believe that Lord R. Churchill himself believed these charges, and they rested solely on personal prejudice and party feeling. He went at length into the history and details of the Aston meeting and the counter demonstration, bringing evidence to show that the violence was due solely to the

mismanagement of the Tory managers, and their attempt to give their meeting the character of a national demonstration. He read letters also and depositions asserting that the first to resort to acts of violence were the Tory stewards, and that roughs had been hired to assault and clear out the Liberals. He created much amusement by reading affidavits of Tory "chuckers-out," describing their performances at the meeting to which he declared the whole of the violence was due. In replying, lastly, to Lord R. Churchill's complaints of his speeches, he read quotations from speeches of Lord Randolph himself and Lord Salisbury, which he insisted were much more calculated to lead to violence; and he concluded by warning the Opposition that if the controversy were conducted in the rancorous tone of these two leaders, it would inevitably take that extended form to which Mr. Gladstone had alluded the other night.

In the debate which ensued, the very limited number of those who sympathised with the President of the Board of Trade was strikingly manifest. One only of his colleagues (Sir C. Dilke) intervened in the discussion, who attempted to introduce a fresh topic by charging the London Conservatives with hiring professional disturbers of public meetings; whilst many speakers on the Opposition side expressed their scepticism of the rebutting evidence which Mr. Chamberlain had so opportunely produced. Sir H. Giffard went so far as to show that the story as told by the affidavits (drawn in a form which rendered evasion of all responsibility easy) was disputable and unworthy of belief, and refused to accept Mr. Chamberlain's version as authentic. Sir S. Northcote, in a mild and temperate speech, said that it was ridiculous to contend that there had been no organised disturbance of the meeting. There was strong presumption that tickets were forged, and his own experience soon showed him at the meeting that there was a band organised under fuglemen to prevent him and the other speakers being heard. Ministers of the Crown, he contended, were bound to use language calculated rather to allay than to excite public passion, and the course taken by Mr. Chamberlain since the commencement of the controversy certainly deserved the condemnation of Parliament.

Mr. Gladstone, while adhering to the general condemnation which he had pronounced on riot and disorder, examined the evidence in this case, contending that strong provocation had been offered by the Conservative party in Birmingham, and expressing a hope that the matter might be the subject of further examination. He canvassed also the language of Mr. Chamberlain's speeches, which he asserted had been misrepresented, and were not so provocative of violence as Lord Salisbury's utterances; and Mr. Chamberlain, he submitted, had said and done nothing deserving of censure. The debate then closed, but before the division was taken, Mr. Gorst read a telegram just received from one of the persons charged by Mr. Chamberlain, declaring it to be

a deliberate fabrication. Whether this *ex parte* statement had any effect upon the voting cannot be decided; but the majority exonerating Mr. Chamberlain from any blameworthy act (214 to 178) was far smaller than a member of the Cabinet, commanding the confidence and sympathy of its supporters, had a right to expect; and it was evident, especially after Mr. Gladstone's remark, that the matter would not be allowed to rest in the unsatisfactory phase which it had reached in the House of Commons. On the following day there were occasional altercations between the more militant Tories and the President of the Board of Trade concerning the use to be made of the depositions read by the latter; but finally it was arranged that the whole matter should be dealt with judicially, should either party think fit to reopen the question.

Another day (October 29) of the debate on the Address was occupied in the discussion of the affairs of South Africa, raised by Sir H. Holland, who complained of the fragmentary and incomplete nature of the papers presented to Parliament, of which the most recent was dated August 14. From the papers printed, however, Sir H. Holland had no difficulty in deducing the "drifting" policy of the Minister, which, he contended, would lead to increased expenditure, and probably involve us in actual war. Lord Derby, in his opinion, had trifled with the High Commissioner, refusing him the support necessary to make his mission a reality; whilst in investigating the circumstances of Mr. Bethell's murder he had shown culpable apathy. Welcoming the promise of co-operation with the Government of the Cape Colony, and congratulating the Government on the despatch of Sir C. Warren, he nevertheless warned them that no peace would be lasting until there had been a display of force in Bechuanaland. Although this speech, and that of Sir F. Milner and Mr. Dawnay, who followed on the same side, failed to prove more than the unwillingness of the Government to deal with the South African question in a decisive or even in a persistent spirit, Mr. Ashley's defence cleared up one or two points of importance. With regard to the charges of apathy in the matter of Mr. Bethell's murder, he maintained that the Colonial Office had acted as soon as it received full information, and pointed out the legal difficulties in the way of bringing the murderers to justice. He replied also to the charge that Sir H. Robinson and our other agents had not been adequately supported, and went at length into a history of the mission of Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Rhodes. No doubt the convention had been broken by the Boers in reference to Montsiosa's territory, but the Transvaal Government, being appealed to, withdrew their proclamation. The freebooters, however, still remained in the territory, and the Government were taking steps to dislodge them by force. In the meantime, the Cape Government had received permission to settle the matter, if possible, by negotiation, but no settlement would be arrived at without the sanction of the British Government, and the freebooters would not

be allowed to remain in Montsioa's territory, unless where approved by the High Commissioner. In vindicating the slowness which seemed to characterise the conduct of the Government, Mr. Ashley claimed that by their patience they had succeeded in obtaining the support of the Africander party for the vindication of British authority. As to complaints about Zululand, he contended that they meant nothing short of the annexation of Zululand.

Sir M. Hicks-Beach urged in opposition that the liberty accorded to the Cape Government was dangerous, unless it would undertake to carry out the engagements to which the British Cabinet had subscribed. The alternative was a large military expedition, which nobody had condemned more strongly than the Prime Minister. The time had come when the Government should no longer trust the word of the Boer Government, but should act on their own responsibility. The Boers must unlearn the lesson of the Pretoria Convention; there must be a real manifestation of British power there; and if it cost men and money, the responsibility must rest with those who had encouraged a belief among those uncivilised people that by persistently flouting the British power they might induce us to abandon the colony.

Mr. Forster, who followed, began by putting numerous questions to the Government; to which, for want of time or for some other reason, no reply was given. He asked for specific information why Mr. Mackenzie had been recalled, what instructions had been given to his successor, and what immediate measures the Government proposed to take to counteract the action of the Boers. He expressed a warm approval of Sir C. Warren's expedition; but he warned the Government that a mere patched-up arrangement between the Cape Government and the Boers would be of no avail, and would not last unless it was supported by a substantial display of force.

A few days later (November 3) the Secretary for the Colonies (Lord Derby) received an influential deputation, who urged that her Majesty's Government should take vigorous steps to maintain their position as the paramount Power in South Africa. In reply, Lord Derby said nobody ever had any idea of our abandoning whatever possession we now held. But we made a mistake in annexing the Transvaal, and a wiser step was never taken than when we undid that act. He was prepared to take all necessary steps to restore order in Bechuanaland, which would not be a long or difficult business, and could not be regarded as directed against the Dutch population of the Transvaal. He could not, however, endorse the views of those gentlemen who wished that the Government should annex or protect Zululand. The Government would watch the appearance of any signs of danger to Natal arising from Zululand, but they must decline to assume the responsibility of governing that native State. In conclusion he said, "There is not the slightest intention on our part to abandon any colony

which the British Government holds, or to sacrifice any claims which we can fairly make. But I can point out that there is a wide distinction between the two things—namely, the abandonment of that which we already possess, and the unlimited extension of territorial responsibilities, which are already more than sufficient for our strength. I am bound to speak frankly, as you have done so to me, and I do not know that there is any other point in what you have said to which I shall think it necessary to refer. One thing I will add. I will take care to mention to my colleagues in the Cabinet the fact of this deputation. I shall put before them, as I have done before, the policy which we have pursued, and if it should be the opinion of those with whom I act that we have failed in discharging our duty to the people of Zululand, my personal convictions on the subject would yield to argument; but I cannot hold out to you the hope that, under present circumstances, it is at all likely that any change will take place in the views of the Government.” And on the following day, also, Mr. Chamberlain found an occasion, in replying to a motion by Mr. Gorst, to express in even clearer terms the decision of the Cabinet: “We are determined at all hazard to use our whole strength, if it be necessary, to maintain the obligations into which we have entered in Bechuanaland.”

In the House of Commons, after a further ventilation of the wrongs of Ireland, and an evening devoted to a discussion of the depressed state of trade and agriculture, the Address was at length (November 4) agreed to without a division; and on the following day the Report was taken by 134 to 18, after an abortive attempt on the part of Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett to introduce a paragraph praying her Majesty to efficiently support General Gordon in establishing a civilised and stable government at Khartoum.

Mr. Gladstone had meanwhile, on the second night of the session (October 24), found means of introducing the Franchise Bill, which was read a first time without discussion. The subsequent proposal to give the Bill precedence in the orders of the day was not allowed to pass without challenge; and ultimately Mr. Gladstone consented to limit the application of his motion to the month of November. The day fixed for the second reading (November 6) was marked by the loss of the statesman who, although he had taken but little part in its discussion in the House, had done more than almost any of his colleagues to make it acceptable to its opponents and lukewarm supporters in the country. Professor Fawcett had, in the few years he had been in office, not only displayed rare gifts as an administrator, but had shown how, under the conditions of English party government, it was possible to unite complete fealty to his chief with unswerving respect for his own convictions. It was this force and straightforwardness of character which won for him an exceptional position in public esteem, and made his premature death felt as an almost national disaster. This feeling found a hearty expression in both Houses of Parliament and from all parties.

In moving the second reading of the "Representation of the People Bill," Mr. Gladstone set an example of brief speaking, which he expressed the hope might be imitated. The Bill being precisely identical with the Franchise Bill when it left the House in the July previous, Mr. Gladstone addressed himself rather to the removal of the obstacles in the way of the measure than to any elaborate exposition of its contents. He said all in his power to prove to the Conservatives that the Government honestly wished to take them into council on the Redistribution Bill, and to give them a full share of influence in shaping its provisions. He declared his inability to recede from the position that the Redistribution Bill could neither be safely united with the Franchise Bill, nor introduced and proceeded with simultaneously with the Franchise Bill, without endangering that Bill. The Franchise Bill was the main object of the Government; and as regarded the principles of Redistribution, he cordially invited the co-operation of the Conservative party, and assured them that so long as the measure was large, and had regard chiefly to population in determining the electoral areas, he did not think it possible to produce one that would not be beneficial. He was willing to concede to the Conservatives that the different pursuits of different electorates should be, as far as possible, considered in laying down the new electoral areas, and he said all he could to remove the groundless fear that it was even possible to pack such electorates so as to subserve party interests.

As soon as Mr. Gladstone sat down, Col. Stanley briefly moved the amendment, of which Lord R. Churchill had given notice, which ran: "That, in the opinion of this House, any measure purporting to provide for the better representation of the people must be accompanied by provisions for the proper arrangement of electoral areas." This having been seconded by Mr. Ecroyd, Mr. Gorst rose, and to the surprise of not a few even on his own side of the House, opposed the amendment, arguing in a forcible speech that the securities for passing a Redistribution Bill were ample, and urging his Conservative friends to make haste to pass the Franchise Bill *nem. con.* Before the House met again (November 7) it was very clear that overtures for a compromise, if not actually made, were anticipated, and that on each side they would meet with a favourable reception. Whether the two successive defeats of the Conservatives at Scarborough had been accepted by the party as an indirect warning of public feeling it is difficult to say, but Sir Richard Cross, in a speech of studied conciliation, complimented Mr. Gladstone on the tone of his speech, approved of all the indications he had given concerning the character of the Redistribution Bill, especially the separate representation of what might be called rural "pursuits," and only lamented that nothing was said about the principle of minority representation. Sir Charles Dilke, who spoke next, reaffirmed all Mr. Gladstone's offers, and emphatically promised that, if full information could be given to

the Opposition concerning the character of the Redistribution scheme without endangering the Franchise Bill, that information should be given. He, too, though hinting his own dislike to any artificial separation of rural from urban "pursuits," indicated his willingness to waive his scruples for the great benefit of a large extension of the representative principle.

Lord R. Churchill was the next to rise, and at once showed that even that minute subsection of the Conservatives, the "Fourth" party, was not without its factions and divisions. He separated himself wholly from Mr. Gorst, and attacking his quondam lieutenant with great bitterness, he entreated the Government to present to Parliament a Redistribution Bill founded chiefly on the principle of population and an approximate equalisation of electoral districts. Of the other Conservative speeches, Mr. Gibson's was much more hostile in tone; while Mr. Chaplin's was, as usual, full of bitterness and animosity. Mr. Goschen attempted to show the Conservative party that they would do well to close with the Prime Minister's overtures, and, by putting the Franchise Bill beyond danger, to place the House of Commons in a position to proceed with the Redistribution Bill. Sir Stafford Northcote, however, gave no sign of any disposition to advise his party in the Upper House to proceed with the Franchise Bill without having been previously satisfied with the contents of the Redistribution Bill; and he declined to give any information as to what kind of a Redistribution Bill his party desired. Lord Hartington, in summing up the debate, showed that the Conservatives demanded satisfaction as to the contents of a measure concerning which their own wishes were altogether divided, Sir Richard Cross desiring one kind of measure, and Lord Randolph Churchill insisting on one of a totally different character; and he remarked that if the Government had already formulated its Redistribution Bill, that Bill would certainly have been made the excuse by one or other section of the Conservative party for an indefinite delay of the Franchise Bill. The speeches throughout were either languid and perfunctory, or mere repetitions of what the speakers had uttered on half a dozen platforms during the recess. There was therefore no desire or object to protract the discussion, and on the close of the second night's debate (November 7) a division was taken, which showed a majority of 140 in favour of the second reading (372 against 232) in an exceptionally full House.

For some time previously there had been doubts raised as to the part the Irish Home Rulers would take; and it was even asserted that, in view of the question of a renewal of the Coercion Bill, they would gain in any effort to weaken the Ministerial majority. At the last moment, however, they decided to vote for a Bill which was to increase to a very imposing degree the poorer cottiers and tenants, and possibly to add still further to their strength in the House of Commons.

The immediate result of a majority so decisive in favour of the Franchise Bill at once revived the hopes of a compromise, in spite of the discouraging tone of the speeches on both sides. But these hopes were speedily dissipated when, on going into committee on the Bill (November 10), Mr. J. Lowther declared that if the Opposition had refrained from placing amendments on the notice paper, it was not because they were more inclined to accept the Bill. Alluding to the current rumours of a private understanding between the party leaders, and repudiating the construction placed by Sir C. Dilke on Sir R. Cross's reference to resolutions, he declared that what the Conservative party required was neither backstairs intrigue nor vague resolutions, nor even the scheme of a Bill, but a definite Act of Parliament which would secure that Enfranchisement and Redistribution should be dealt with together. Mr. Gladstone and Sir S. Northcote did their best to smooth the tone of the discussion thus started, but it was obvious that the attitude of the Conservatives had been considerably modified since the division on the second reading. In the interval the election for South Warwickshire had become known, and Mr. Sampson Lloyd, a militant Tory, had been returned by a large majority (1,176) over the Liberal candidate, Lord William Compton, who hoped to retain the seat which Mr. Leigh had wrested from the Conservatives at the general election. On the present occasion the Liberal candidate polled 600 votes less than in 1880, whilst the Conservative polling was increased by fully 400. It was therefore not surprising if some among the Conservative party thought as well as hoped that everything was to be gained by forcing an immediate dissolution. The leaders, however, seemed to have held that better use might be made of their suddenly revealed power in the counties at least (for at Scarborough, where two elections had been held, the signs of a Conservative reaction were too slight to merit notice); and consequently when, at a later hour, Colonel Stanley proposed his amendment on Clause 2 of the Bill, it received but slight support, and was promptly disposed of. Its object was to postpone the operation of the Franchise Bill until both the Redistribution and Boundary Bills had been passed. Mr. Gladstone, in reply, showed by contrasting the speeches of Lord R. Churchill and Sir S. Northcote that the Opposition itself was so divided on the question of Redistribution, that it would be impossible to introduce a Bill which would not be made the subject of sharp party conflict, and which was not certain to be defeated. In spite of Sir S. Northcote's assurance, therefore, that the Opposition had no desire to raise frivolous quarrels, but would give any Redistribution Bill a candid consideration, the amendment was rejected by 195 to 109, and the remaining clauses having been agreed to without further opposition, the Bill passed through the committee, and was reported without amendment at an early hour in the evening.

Whether at this moment the compromise, which was certainly

then meditated, if indeed its basis had not been already sketched out, was in danger, cannot be asserted. The press, apparently representing public opinion, held that the real point at issue between the rival chiefs was the question from whom the first suggestions should come; and in reply it was said that the wishes of the Opposition had already been openly explained on more than one platform, whilst the Government scheme had been sufficiently revealed by the *Standard* to make its principle understood. It was, therefore, by no means without reason, that on the last stage of the Franchise Bill (November 11) Mr. Goschen should have taken occasion to comment on the obvious change of tone in the previous day's debate, and to express the regret which he felt sure would be shared by the country that the conciliatory disposition so manifest on the second reading of the Bill had totally disappeared. He denied that the Government had invited their opponents to introduce a Redistribution Bill of their own, but they had been asked in the interests of a friendly arrangement to give some indication of their views, and he contended that in the interests of the country it was better that the question of Redistribution should be settled by agreement between the two sides than that both parties should go to the country, outbidding each other in regard to Redistribution, in order to obtain democratic support at an election. Lord J. Manners agreed that there had been a change of tone on the previous night, but it began with the Prime Minister and the hectoring speech of the Home Secretary. The demand that the Opposition should state its views was preposterous, and the proper time for that was when the Government brought in its Bill. But as long as the Government chose to divorce Enfranchisement from Redistribution it was impossible to hold communication with the Government, either public or private.

Mr. Gladstone said that there had been a change in the tone and temper of the debate was obvious, but it began, he maintained, with the speech of Mr. Lowther, which was followed up by Sir S. Northcote's reduction of Sir R. Cross's significant suggestion of resolutions to the level of a mere *obiter dictum*. He himself had adhered to all the conciliatory declarations which he had made; and notwithstanding Lord J. Manners' declaration that no communications were possible, he did not recede from his desire for an agreement. Though he denied that he had asked the Opposition to bring in a Bill, he still continued to think that the settlement of the question would be promoted by the other side giving some intimation of their views.

Sir R. Cross, referring to his speech, said his contention had always been that there must be a guarantee against the possibility of a general election on the Franchise Bill without Redistribution. Mr. Ritchie regretted the change of tone which had taken place since the previous week, and had read with dismay the speech of Mr. Lowther. It was impossible either for the Government or for the House of Lords to surrender all that they had

demand, but he strenuously advocated conciliation, and declared that it would be a scandal upon either party which prevented a settlement being arrived at. The conversation was prolonged for some time; the more independent Conservatives, like Mr. Stuart-Wortley, indicating a wish for conciliatory measures; but the Bill was at length read a third time without a division, although several members on the Opposition side cried "No."

No delay was shown by the House of Lords in taking up the measure. Having been formally introduced (November 13), it was intimated almost simultaneously that, on the motion for the second reading, Ministers would make in both Houses a statement of their intentions, and what concessions they were prepared to make to their opponents in order to avert a deadlock or a crisis. The position taken up by the two parties at this juncture may be briefly summarised. The Conservatives claimed for the House of Lords an equal voice in the discussion of the details of Redistribution, and this they declared to be impossible unless Franchise and Redistribution were considered together. At the same time the Conservatives had given their support to a Redistribution Bill more liberal or more advanced than even that sketched out by or for the Cabinet. The Government, thereupon, allowed it to be understood that they were willing to accept a Bill drafted in this sense; and were prepared to give guarantees that the measure in its leading features should not be altered in the House of Commons. The difficulty raised by the Conservative leaders was that such an arrangement contained no security against a general election taking place with the new franchise applied to the old constituencies, in which case the chances of the Conservatives even maintaining their actual numbers in the House of Commons became most doubtful. To this the Government replied that the postponement of the operation of the Franchise Bill until January 1, 1886, as already agreed upon in the House of Commons, was a virtual if not an absolute security of the guarantee demanded. The negotiations to bring about an understanding had been going on, it was subsequently admitted, from the date of the second reading of the Franchise Bill in the Commons, and the contradictory rumours which were bruited about were probably only echoes of the difficulties which arose from time to time. When, therefore, on the day before (November 17) that appointed for the second reading of the Franchise Bill, Lord Granville rose to make a proposal on the part of the Government, it was at once understood that a means had been found of solving the difficulty which had hitherto barred the way to a complete understanding. Premising that the action about to be taken that week by the Peers, with regard to the Franchise Bill, would be of great importance in its general bearings, he went on to sketch briefly the points of difference between the majority of the House of Lords and the Government. In view of these he was authorised to state that the Government thought it possible to meet the objection raised by

some Peers to their mode of procedure. Without sacrificing their object the Government could not come to any understanding unless they received an assurance that the Franchise Bill should pass at an early date, during that session; but if they received that assurance, they would be prepared to make the main provisions of a Redistribution Bill, or even a draft of a Bill drawn in accordance with the plan already sketched by Mr. Gladstone, the subject of friendly communications. They would undertake to move in the House of Commons the second reading of the Redistribution Bill simultaneously with the Franchise Bill going into committee, or reaching any further stage in their lordships' House; and they would further undertake to proceed with the Redistribution Bill at all possible speed, so that it might pass through the House of Commons at an early period of next year. Lord Salisbury, without at the moment expressing any opinion on the proposal itself, asked whether the passing of the Franchise Bill before Christmas was to be a condition precedent, and whether an agreement between the Government and the Opposition on the principles of Redistribution was to be a condition precedent. Lord Granville answered the first question in the affirmative and the second in the negative.

The Lord Chancellor added that on assurance that the Franchise Bill would be passed without delay the Government would be prepared to produce at once their Redistribution Bill, and have it read a first time as soon as any one could reasonably desire. In the House of Commons Mr. Gladstone made a similar statement, adding that on receiving an adequate assurance that the Franchise Bill would be passed in the course of that session, the Government would be willing to make the main provisions of their Redistribution Bill the subject of friendly communication, and would undertake to move its second reading simultaneously with the committee or some subsequent stage of the Franchise Bill in the Lords. They would also engage to make the passing of the Redistribution Bill next year a vital question. Sir S. Northcote reserved his opinion on the substance of the proposal, which, he said, had come upon him as a surprise in the form in which it was presented. Mr. Gladstone said he had no intention of making any appeal, his observations having been rather in the nature of a prolonged notice. In answer to questions from Mr. J. Morley and Sir W. Lawson, Mr. Gladstone said that his pledge to make the Redistribution Bill a vital question referred to both Houses, and that the Government might be trusted to see that the security which they took was adequate.

The process by which this understanding was arrived at was fully described by the *Times*, according to which journal the Government received an assurance that the Conservative leaders would, prior to the second reading of the Franchise Bill, intimate their willingness to discuss the Redistribution Bill with the Government. At the same time they would offer Mr. Gladstone an

adequate assurance that the Franchise Bill should be passed by the House of Lords so soon as a Redistribution Bill, satisfactory to all parties, had been framed. A statement made by the *Standard*, that the Government, in writing, waived their claims for an adequate assurance, was declared, subsequently, to be misleading. But it was agreed that when such an assurance was given the Government would not only bring in their Redistribution Bill, but would carry it to a second reading. In return the Opposition undertook that, simultaneously with the affirmation of the principles of the Redistribution Bill by the House of Commons, they would redeem their pledge of passing the Franchise Bill into law. Finally, the Government pledged themselves to take up the Redistribution Bill as early as possible in the new year, and to push it on through the remaining stages with all possible expedition; and relying upon the loyal support of the Opposition being given to the joint scheme, they would stake, not only their credit, but their existence, upon the passing of the Bill into law in the session of 1885.

In the House of Lords, on the motion to read the Bill a second time (November 18), the progress of the negotiations was further explained by Lord Salisbury, who, referring to what had passed on the previous day, said that at first he was not altogether satisfied with Earl Granville's remarks. He drew from them—no doubt inaccurately—the conclusion that, previously to any communication or consultation between the two sides on the Redistribution Bill, the Opposition should undertake that the Franchise Bill should be passed into law before the close of the year. He need not dwell on the objections to such an arrangement, as by it the Opposition would be parting with their liberty, and might afterwards find that, through no fault of theirs and no fault of the Government, the end they had in view could not be gained. He had spoken to some friends in the other House, and finding that they had not understood Mr. Gladstone as he had understood the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, he requested his relative, Mr. Balfour, to enter into communication with the Government. The result was a statement by the Marquess of Hartington that the Government would receive in trust a communication from the Opposition that they would go into consultation on the Redistribution Bill, and would not ask for the assurance as to the passing of the Franchise Bill as a preliminary to such a consultation. It was impossible to exaggerate the importance of that explanation. The Opposition could now enter into communications with the Government on the subject of the Redistribution Bill. If they came to an agreement as to that Bill, they were to give an assurance that the Franchise Bill should pass. If they did not, they would be just where they were at present. But he did not think that there was a likelihood of no agreement being come to, because the Opposition would reciprocate the spirit of trust in which the Government would receive their request for

communications. He and his friends thought there would be adequate security for the passing of the Redistribution Bill in 1885 if they rightly understood the assurance of the Government on that head. To make this clear he asked whether the Government would regard, not only the second reading of the Redistribution Bill, but all its provisions as agreed on between the two parties, to be a vital question, and whether they would consider the passing of the Bill in 1885 to be a vital question. Earl Granville said that the Government pledged itself to make every effort to push the Redistribution Bill through Parliament at an early period of the next year, and he had no doubt that, aided by the Conservative party, they would succeed in getting it through. They would make all the general principles of the Bill a vital question, but no Government could be asked to pledge itself not to consent to any amendments being made in a Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time without a division; and, on the motion of Lord Salisbury, the committee stage was postponed for a fortnight, an interval Lord Granville thought quite sufficient to bring the question to a final and satisfactory settlement.

Outside of Parliament, however, the speakers on both sides seemed more concerned to prove that they had made no concession, and that each party had gained a substantial advantage over its opponents. For example, Mr. Mundella, opening a Liberal Club at Elswick (November 19), said he had been assured that the Government had made a surrender; but was it a surrender? The Liberal programme was not exhausted, and if they had to fight, they had better fight with five million electors than with three. If Lord Salisbury did not approve of their Redistribution Bill, the Government would be no worse off, and the country would see that it was not their fault if it was plunged into another agitation. Following him, Mr. John Morley also spoke, deprecating a hurried judgment as to a surrender. Still he foresaw that difficulties might arise. They were being taunted with respect to the autumn demonstrations, but he believed that if it had not been for those demonstrations the Lords would have adhered to their original demands; and besides that, he believed they had given such a shock to the House of Lords as it would never recover from.

The Conservatives, on their side, also put their own interpretation on recent events and their probable results. Lord Salisbury, in reply to an address from the Essex Conservatives, admitted that the so-called crisis had passed away, and that the Government had conceded as much in the way of arrangement as might have been anticipated. He denied that the Conservative peers had ever endeavoured to force a dissolution of Parliament, which, indeed, they never feared; but it was not the duty of the House of Lords to refuse to consent to arrangements which it considered judicious, merely for the purpose of bringing about a dissolution. The

arrangement which had been made no doubt depended for its execution in some of its most important particulars on the pledged word of their opponents. He had heard that fact quoted as a ground for dissatisfaction with what had been done. To his mind it was no ground for such dissatisfaction. Though they were dealing with their opponents, they were dealing with English gentlemen; and he was quite sure that any paltering with the pledged word which they had passed would be as repugnant to their natural instincts as it would be fatal to the position of any political leaders who could bring themselves so low. He did not think there was the slightest ground for uneasiness or disturbance on that head, and had no doubt that if an agreement could be come to, each side would exert its utmost to do justice to all interests. The difficulties in the way would be considerable; but he could not help feeling that the ample discussion which this subject had received in every part of the country during the past autumn had very much smoothed the way to a satisfactory arrangement.

It was possibly in order to enable the Government to define its attitude towards the Radical party, rather than with any intention of impeding the negotiations between the party leaders, that Mr. Labouchere, in the interval (November 21) brought forward a motion having for its object to revolutionise the existing constitution. In an incisive and able speech he called attention to the fact that the Conservative party had for many years been able, through its permanent majority in the House of Lords, to alter, defeat, or delay legislation recommended by the responsible advisers of the Crown and approved by the nation through its elected representatives, and submitted a resolution to the effect that it was desirable to make such changes in the relations of the two Houses as would remedy that state of things. There was, he said, no better exemplification of the power which the House of Lords possessed than the fact that a Prime Minister, with a large and unprecedented majority at his back in the Commons, had had to retreat before the Lords on the Franchise and Redistribution questions. It was true that the Franchise Bill was secured by the arrangement which had been made, but it was only at the price of the humiliation and extinction of the Commons on the Redistribution Bill. Sir W. Lawson having seconded the motion, Mr. Gladstone at once rose to oppose it, saying that he hoped never to be a party to any arrangement by which the House of Commons would be either humiliated or extinguished. With regard to the Franchise Bill communications had indeed been instituted, and met with very general approval. His first duty therefore had been to see that nothing should interfere with the result which the Government anticipated. As to the resolution, he was not prepared to treat the hereditary principle with that unqualified contempt with which the mover and seconder had spoken of it. With only one House of Parliament there would arise

a state of things in which all the members of the House of Lords would, like other persons, be qualified to be elected members of the Commons; and his position was that in those circumstances a proportion of them would be elected infinitely larger than their relation to the general community would warrant. No discussion of importance ensued, but before the division was taken a considerable number of Liberal members, including Sir C. Dilke and Mr. Chamberlain, left the House, although the Government whips "told" for the majority (147 against 73) by which the motion was rejected.

During the next fortnight the process of arrangement was steadily pursued. Lord Salisbury and Sir S. Northcote attended the meetings of the Cabinet, and conducted the negotiations with the specially selected delegates of that body. Naturally there were rumours of misunderstandings more or less serious, but as time wore on, it was clear, from the public utterances of those in a position to know the real facts, that the basis of the compromise was never in jeopardy, and that the ultimate decision on all questions of detail would have to be left to Parliament. The Government, throughout the preliminary negotiations, showed no desire to extort any direct pledge from the Opposition as to the passing of the Franchise Bill, until the Opposition leaders had satisfied themselves that the Redistribution Bill would be drawn upon lines of which they could approve. The Radicals protested that by their courtesy the Government had humiliated themselves in coming to terms as to Redistribution before passing the Franchise Bill; but the more responsible Liberals declared that their leaders had only sacrificed the shadow whilst holding on to the substance, which was a determination not to bring forward a Redistribution Bill which might give the Conservatives an excuse for rejecting the Franchise Bill. Sir Stafford Northcote did perhaps well to prepare his supporters at the Beaconsfield Club (November 24) for the changes in store. "The Conservatives could not expect," he said, "that the great settlement now in hand could be accomplished without considerable changes; and he had no doubt that when the Redistribution Bill now in preparation was introduced into the House of Commons, many persons would be startled by its proposals, which would appear to be of a very large character. But on the passing of a Bill of this kind they must take care to give full and fair play to all the interests of the country, and to bring about a settlement which might be of a durable and permanent character. These alterations in the representative system of the country ought to be settled on a broad basis, so as to give as little occasion as possible for reopening the question."

At the very opposite pole of political thought there was a more openly expressed feeling of satisfaction, suggesting that in the interval the Radicals had found cause to modify their views. Mr. John Morley, addressing (November 25) the Liberal

Six Hundred of Leeds, declared himself unable to see the Liberal humiliation of which he heard both Tories and Liberals talking. On the contrary, he considered that the Leeds Conference, which met in the autumn of 1883, was now far nearer to carrying its whole programme than it had ever been in the interval. The so-called "humiliation" of the Liberals was about to result in the fullest possible fulfilment of the most sanguine Liberal anticipations. All that the Government had done was to act upon the suggestion made by Lord Hartington, and concurred in by Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Chamberlain during the recess; all that the Conservatives had done was to recede absolutely from what they had asserted in criticising that suggestion. Lord Salisbury had declined to have anything to say to the Redistribution Bill till it had passed the House of Commons and gone up to the Lords. Lord John Manners and Mr. Lowther had repudiated the notion of co-operating in drafting a Bill which would give some promise of permanence. What was going on was a complete reversal of all the Tories had insisted on, while the Liberal Government was not making a single concession. As for the ultimate quarrel with the Lords, the Commons must be enormously strengthened by the proposed reform; and one of two things must happen: either the Lords would assume quietly the attitude of a merely consultative Second Chamber, which could not pretend to overrule the deliberate will of the Representative Chamber; or if they did not, they would soon after the passing of the Reform Bill have a renewal of the struggle of this year under circumstances which must ensure an easy victory to the Commons.

Allowing for the different standpoints of the speakers, very similar hopes were expressed by politicians whose aspirations, it might be presumed, were altogether divergent. At length, after a week's adjournment, both Houses reassembled, and Mr. Gladstone, in a very brief speech, altogether without rhetorical display and sympathetic enthusiasm, presented to the House of Commons the results of the negotiations, and moved for leave to bring in a Bill dealing with the most crucial party rights and susceptibilities which had been settled outside the arena of Parliamentary conflict. Taking the scheme as published in the *Standard* as a fair expression of the views of the Cabinet, when a desperate struggle seemed inevitable, it appeared that the Bill, as unfolded by Mr. Gladstone, had been broadened and rendered a more permanent measure under the influence of Lord Salisbury. The leading features of the Bill may be briefly summarised:—

(1) By Schedule A, framed upon the principle of totally disfranchising all boroughs with a population up to 15,000, a few rural boroughs like Cricklade, Shoreham, &c., and the corrupt boroughs of Sandwich and Macclesfield, would be merged into their respective county divisions or districts.

(2) By Schedule B all towns with a population up to 50,000 would cease to be represented by more than one member each, and

this principle would be applied to two counties, Rutlandshire and Herefordshire, from each of which one member was taken.

The two schemes would thus show the following contrasts:—

DISFRANCHISED.

<i>The original Liberal scheme.</i>				<i>The Gladstone-Salisbury scheme.</i>			
LIB. CON. H.R.				LIB. CON. H.R.			
72 boroughs under 10,000 pop.	30	34	8	72 boroughs under 10,000 pop.	30	34	8
6 agricultural boroughs (2 each)	8	4	—	19 boroughs between 10,000 and 15,000	10	6	3
Macclesfield and Sandwich (2 each)	2	2	—	6 agricultural boroughs (2 each)	8	4	—
				Macclesfield and Sandwich	2	2	—
				8 boroughs (2 each)	10	6	—

PARTIALLY DISFRANCHISED.

LIB. CON. H.R.				LIB. CON. H.R.			
40 boroughs between 10,000 and 40,000	27	11	2	27 boroughs between 15,000 and 40,000	17	8	2
2 counties (Rutland and Hereford)	—	2	—	8 boroughs between 40,000 and 50,000	5½	1½	1
				2 counties	—	2	—
				London City	—	2	—

The combined effect of Schedules A and B would be to extinguish 160 seats, and the 6 seats which had been extinguished for some years would be revived. Of the seats thus made available the counties would get 96, of which 64 were in England; and in addition to existing boroughs new boroughs would be created out of counties which would receive 8 seats. As to the distribution of these, Mr. Gladstone explained that seven would be added to the metropolis, taken partly out of the home counties, and that the total augmentation of metropolitan members would be 37, but the City would lose 2 members. Liverpool would have 6 additional members, Glasgow 4, Birmingham 4, Manchester 3, Leeds 2, and Sheffield 3. As to the counties, Yorkshire would have 16 additional members, Lancashire 15, Middlesex 5, Cork 5, Durham 4, and Lanarkshire 4. With regard to the rest, he said the Government had decided to apply to all the electoral areas of the country regarded as units exactly the same principle. Counties would be dealt with on exactly the same principle as boroughs, and every county and borough in England and Wales would be dealt with on identical lines with the counties and boroughs in Scotland and Ireland. The net result would be that England would obtain 6 additional seats, and Scotland 12 additional seats. No change would be made in the representation of Ireland, and Wales also would remain untouched. Next he dealt with the division of electoral areas, and stated that, as a general rule, the Bill would adopt (as a means, among other reasons, for securing variety of representation) the system of one-member districts, with a few exceptions, such as the City of London, and existing towns between 50,000 and 165,000 population, which would continue to be represented by 2 members. In conclusion Mr. Gladstone

announced that a Boundary Commission had been appointed, consisting of Sir J. Lambert, Mr. Pelham, Sir F. Sandford, Mr. J. J. Henley, Colonel Owen Jones, and Major H. Tulloch, which was already at work, and would complete its labours in a couple of months.

In view of the advanced period of the year, Mr. Gladstone proposed to take the next stage of the Bill with as little delay as possible, and suggested as an acceptable course that it might then be read a second time as a necessary formality, whilst the general discussion was reserved until the motion that the Speaker leave the chair, when the House reassembled after the Christmas vacation. A somewhat desultory conversation then followed, in the course of which a promise was given that the instructions given to the Boundary Commissioners should be made known, and the Bill was then ordered to be brought in and read a first time.

By the daily press the Redistribution Bill was received with somewhat hesitating approval. The *Times* held that "the characteristic features of the Bill are the adoption of the single-member system and the increase in the numbers of the House, and we must frankly admit that both appear to us of very doubtful expediency. The latter has been obviously dictated by a somewhat pusillanimous calculation that it was better to avoid a struggle with the Parnellite party."

The *Daily News*, which in general warmly supported the Government, advocated the objections which in its view applied to the "one-member" principle for the local divisions of great towns. "We see no reason to withdraw or modify them. But the Government have had to come to an agreement with their opponents, and to sacrifice the best to the practicable. We cannot doubt that there will be some disappointment felt at the absence of any proposal to deal with the question of proportional representation in a direct way."

The *Daily Telegraph* and the *Standard* were agreed in pronouncing the scheme broad and statesmanlike, in which Liberal aspirations and Conservative convictions were alike respected. The Conservative organ went on to say, "It would, in truth, be trifling with the necessities of the case to base a plan of settlement on any but the boldest lines. The larger the constituencies are, the greater is the chance that the elected members will represent the dominant majority of the nation. Reduce the areas, and there is a likelihood that the classes which, having regard to the total population of the country, are in a minority, will have here and there a local preponderance, and as a consequence a voice in the national councils. Very few, we imagine, will base their complaints on the ground that the measure is not sufficiently wide and comprehensive."

From the provincial press, however, especially from the large centres of Liberal opinion, there arose an almost universal cry against the proposed division of the great cities into single-member

wards or districts. Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool, and Hull took the lead in protesting against an innovation which was attributed to Lord Salisbury; but to these the London Liberal organs replied that the objection raised was one rather of sentiment than of practical politics. The Conservative organs, on the other hand, maintained that the result of the application of the principle would be a more varied representation of classes and interests than could ever have been obtained by the most careful grouping.

The immediate outcome, however, of the Redistribution Bill, apart from any increased popularity it may have brought to its authors, was the secession of Mr. Courtney, who for some time had held office as Financial Secretary to the Treasury. From the first moving of a new Reform Bill, Mr. Courtney and his colleague, Mr. Fawcett, had proclaimed their belief that any measure brought forward by the Liberal party should "aim at making the House of Commons the council of the nation by bringing within it, in due proportion, representatives of all forms of political thought." In the one-member system Mr. Courtney saw in the Government Bill a totally contrary tendency—the narrowing and tightening of the lines of approach to Parliament. Immediately, therefore, after the bringing in the Bill, Mr. Courtney placed his resignation in Mr. Gladstone's hands, to the general regret of his party as well as to many of his opponents who had learned to respect his unyielding consistency. It was no secret that efforts were made to retain his services on terms highly honourable to all concerned, but Mr. Courtney persevered in his determination; and it was also admitted that, had Mr. Fawcett been still alive, he would have acted in like manner.

On the motion for the second reading (December 4), Mr. Courtney explained the causes which had led to his retirement. He objected to the Bill chiefly on account of the single member system, which he regarded as a new departure, fraught with the gravest consequences to the character of the House and to the political life of the country. He contended that this system would fail altogether in obtaining the judgment of the people, and that under it there was no security that the majority of representatives would not be returned by the minority of the electors. The town members would be of the vestry order, and the county members would be ratepayers' members; there would be no "permeation," and one district of a town would be set in antagonism to another. Dismissing as unacceptable the *scrutin de liste* and the proposal to leave the option to each individual town, he expounded at length a scheme founded on the "one man one vote" principle, but giving to each voter the opportunity of saying to whom he would give his vote in the second and third place if it were not needed for his first choice.

In these opinions Mr. Courtney was ably supported by Mr. Goschen and Sir J. Lubbock, and replied to by Mr. Gladstone,

who denied that the one-member system was an innovation, or that it had in any way tended to lower the House of Commons. A resolution by Sir H. Tyler in favour of the principle of representation in proportion to the population having been negatived, the Bill was read a second time without division, and the principle on which it was based thereby confirmed by the whole House.

Meanwhile, in the House of Lords, the committee stage of the Franchise Bill had, with the consent of the Government, been postponed until the day on which the Redistribution Bill was read a second time in the Commons (December 4); and, after a few protests and ineffectual attempts to introduce amendments, it was reported unaltered. On the following day (December 5) it was read a third time without debate, and became law on the next, just before the House adjourned. The "peaceful revolution" which the platform agitation of the autumn had rendered possible, and at one moment seemed on the point of rendering impossible, had been effected in a short session of six weeks, without more show of opposition than a single party division after a short debate. The frank adoption by Lord Salisbury of a democratic programme of reform had greatly assisted the solution of the question; whilst the previous agreement of the leaders of the two great parties rendered futile the opposition of those whose seats were threatened with extinction. There were not wanting, however, many who foresaw that in the discussion of the clauses and schedules of the Bill difficulties would arise which would seriously compromise the understanding arrived at; whilst others viewed with suspicion and as an innovation the settlement of a great party question by private negotiation.

At the same time the winter session had singularly falsified all the predictions its proposers had made concerning it. It was to have been complete in itself, its discussions were to have been limited to a single subject, and its result was to have convinced the country that the Government was and must be supreme. By a strange fatality, however, the necessary substitution of adjournment for prorogation saved Mr. Gladstone from the apparent inconsistency between his words and his acts. Towards the close of the previous Parliament he had expressed strongly his objections to Parliament prolonging its existence to a seventh session; but had the original idea of closing the winter session at Christmas been adhered to, Parliament would have assembled for its seventh session in the February following. The topics, moreover, debated during the winter sitting were not limited to those connected with Parliamentary Reform. The debate on the Queen's Speech had embraced the state of affairs in Ireland, in South Africa, and in Birmingham, as well as the condition of industry and agriculture throughout the United Kingdom.

Lord Northbrook's absence was the cause of the postponement of other topics; but on his return to England (November 2) the

account he had to render of his mission to Egypt, and the state into which the Admiralty had allowed our naval defences to drift, became subjects of close inquiry.

On Egyptian affairs the Government maintained an embarrassed silence. At the close of the summer they had replied to the foreign Powers that Lord Northbrook was being sent to Egypt as a High Commissioner, in order to deal authoritatively, and in the name of his colleagues, with the whole question of Egyptian finance, administration, and future government. Three months passed; the High Commissioner returned, having apparently aggravated rather than removed the obstacles to a speedy solution, whilst his report was carefully withheld from the knowledge of the public. The most strongly supported rumour pointed to a reduction from 5 to 3 per cent. in the interest paid by Egypt to England in respect of the purchase-money of the Suez Canal shares, and the release of Egypt from the cost of maintaining the British army of occupation. The relief thus given to the Egyptian exchequer would enable her to pay the interest on a loan to be guaranteed by England, the proceeds of which would be applied to the payment of the Alexandrian indemnities. If these were Lord Northbrook's original recommendations, they apparently did not receive the approval or endorsement of his colleagues. For judging from the Ministerial proposals as communicated to foreign Cabinets, and made known through foreign sources, it was surmised that the settlement of the financial question was based upon a suspension of the Sinking Fund, a loan of eight millions guaranteed by England, the paying off of the Daira and Domain loans with the help of England, and the maintenance by her of the army of occupation. In return the taxation of Lower Egypt was to be slightly, and that of Upper Egypt considerably, reduced. Lord Northbrook, in referring to the statement to this effect which had appeared in the *Times*, declared it to be "incorrect in several essential particulars, and most prejudicial to the interests" of Egypt. No more authoritative statement, however, was made; and as, by general consent, the point of difference between England and France, acting in the name of the Continental Powers (Italy excepted), was whether the loan should be issued under the sole guarantee of England, or the joint guarantee of two or more powers, it was held that Lord Northbrook's recommendations had been more or less accurately stated, and that they had not been more favourably received by his colleagues than were their modified proposals by the European Cabinets.

Meanwhile the Government had on various occasions been questioned as to the steps which were being taken for the relief of General Gordon. Lord Wolseley had crossed the Soudanese frontier on August 23, with a force, including marines, of about 10,000 British troops; of these, 6,000 were already south of Assouan (November 24), or moving up the Nile. Good accounts continued to be received at intervals from General Gordon, in-

cluding one message (November 4), consisting of 800 words, which the Government refused to publish. In view of the rumours that food and ammunition were failing in Khartoum, Lord Wolseley had been instructed (October 30) to advance with all speed. A little further information was obtained when Lord Hartington (November 13) moved a supplementary estimate of 1,000,000*l.* for the Nile expedition, and explained the reasons which had guided the Government in choosing the Nile route, the main consideration being the enormous cost of the land transport if the Suakin route had been chosen. Lord Wolseley's instructions did not preclude him from taking any steps which might be practicable to establish a settled form of government in Khartoum, and the two objects of the mission—the relief of General Gordon and the settlement of Khartoum—were connected with each other. Colonel Stanley expressed a hope that the expedition would not be too late. Sir W. Lawson protested against the expenditure of millions of money and hundreds of lives for the rescue of a man who did not need to be rescued, and who had disregarded the instructions given him. Sir W. Barttelot said that if General Graham had been allowed to operate towards Berber after the battle of Tamanieb, Khartoum would have been relieved long ago. In reply to the criticisms which were offered from all parts of the House, Lord Hartington admitted that the expedition had encountered greater delays than had been anticipated in getting to Dongola and Debbeh; that consequently the advance had not probably been made so soon as Lord Wolseley had intended. The vote was ultimately agreed to by 73 to 17, as well as one for 324,000*l.* for navy services in connection with Egypt, and thenceforward to the close of the session the subject was scarcely again referred to.

In South Africa the disturbed state of affairs had, as has been stated, necessitated the despatch of Sir Charles Warren with a force of about 6,500 men. Among the numerous instances of lawlessness which the Boer Government had been unwilling or unable to prevent, the murder of Mr. Christopher Bethell on July 31 was the most conspicuous. The Colonial Office, however, seems to have attached but little importance to this incident, for it appeared after persistent questioning (October 28) that the first steps taken to bring the murderers to justice were three months after the outrage had been committed. In this case, however, as in the larger one of the need of increasing the force in Basutoland, Lord Derby had been anxious not to intervene until the colonial authorities had shown their inability or their unwillingness to act; and even at the last moment it was asserted that efforts had been made, but without success, to impose upon Sir Charles Warren conditions which would have seriously hampered his movements and military policy. No allusion was made to these rumours by Lord Hartington when (November 13), after obtaining his vote for Egypt, he proceeded to move a vote of

675,000*l.* for army purposes in connection with the expedition to Bechuanaland, to expel the Dutch freebooters from Montsioa's territory. This, he said, was an outside estimate, at least for any expenditure which could occur within the financial year, though not sufficient if the matter were pushed to the bitter end. Sir M. Hicks-Beach wished that an opportunity should be given for a discussion on the subject. Sir H. Holland condemned the policy which had necessitated the expedition. Sir J. Lubbock said that unless the Cape Government co-operated, the position, as regarded Bechuanaland, ought to be reconsidered.

The South African Vote seemed to provoke more hostility than the Egyptian; for it was only after a keen debate, in which Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Illingworth, and other Radicals took part, that the supplementary votes were taken by 78 to 31, showing, in each case, a largely increased minority of dissentients.

A few days later (November 20), on the report of Supply, Mr. Gorst again brought up the subject of Sir C. Warren's mission to Bechuanaland, and asked for some further assurance that an ineffectual agreement would not be patched up. Mr. Chamberlain said it was impossible to exclude a hope that the freebooters might be induced to retire peaceably from Montsioa's territory; but if they declined, the force to compel them to go had been provided, and would be used. Mr. Forster said that even if the Cape Government succeeded in their peaceful efforts with regard to Goshen and the attack upon Montsioa, the obligation which rested upon us to secure order in Bechuanaland was not thereby discharged. If we were persuaded or contented to leave the territory to take care of itself without a police force to keep order there, we should have precisely the same sort of thing happening as we had now been compelled to deal with. Sir M. Hicks-Beach said he should have been glad if Sir C. Warren's special attention had been called to the crimes committed in Goshen, and to the necessity of exacting the due punishment of the persons who had committed them. Mr. Ashley stated that there were great legal difficulties in the way, and the Colonial Office were consulting the law officers as to the course they should pursue.

To meet this extra expenditure, the resources of the year were wholly insufficient; for although, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer explained (November 17), there had been a slight increase in the receipts over the Budget Estimate, the margin was too small to cover more than the usual Supplementary Estimates of the year. Under these circumstances he proposed to raise the income tax for the year from 5*d.* to 6*d.* in the pound, making its action retrospective, by which he hoped to realise an additional sum of 1,920,000*l.*; but of this, 720,000*l.* would not be collected until after the close of the financial year. The Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposal brought up the usual charges and counter charges of wastefulness and thriftlessness common among rival financiers. Lord George Hamilton complained of this step being

taken at a moment of severe depression. Having compared the increased expenditure of the present Government with that of their predecessors, he observed that this increase of taxation would, at all events, bring home to every one what was the cost of a policy of perpetual vacillation and ineptitude. Mr. Rylands reproached the Government for having necessitated this vote by following so closely in the footsteps of their predecessors. Mr. W. H. Smith commented upon the constant growth of the public expenditure, and insisted upon the urgency of immediate provision being made for strengthening the navy. Mr. Gladstone maintained that the whole war expenditure was due to the acts of the last Government, especially to the engagement to support the Khedive in conjunction with France, and the ill-omened and dishonourable annexation of the Transvaal. Sir S. Northcote contended that if the Government had pursued a firm and straightforward policy in Egypt and the Transvaal, the evil consequences which had ensued might have been prevented. Sir J. Lubbock having expressed dissent from Sir S. Northcote's views, and some explanations having been given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the vote was agreed to without a division.

The state of the Navy, which during the recess had been made the subject of many speeches and newspaper articles, was naturally not allowed by the Opposition to pass unnoticed in Parliament. At an early period Lord Northbrook promised to lay before the House of Lords a statement of the actual condition of our naval resources, and of the views of the Government. The discussion was, however, put off on more than one occasion, and Lord Carnarvon found an opportunity of inaugurating a preliminary debate on our colonial defences. Towards the close of Lord Beaconsfield's administration a Royal Commission—of which Lord Carnarvon was the chairman—had been appointed to inquire into the defences of our colonial possessions. In 1881 and the following year the Commission, after a most careful inquiry, presented their report, dealing with the whole question; but their principle, as well as the evidence on which it was founded, remained a carefully guarded secret. Three years passed by without any attempt being made by the Government to carry out any of the recommendations of the Commission, although the defenceless state of the coaling stations on the road to Australia was sufficiently patent. In the summer of 1884, however, it transpired that the Government had appointed a Departmental Committee to deal with the suggestions of the Royal Commission. The estimates, as framed by the latter, declared that an expenditure of at least two millions would be required to place the principal coaling depôts in a state to hold out against the improvements of naval gunnery and science. The Departmental Committee at once reduced this estimate by one-half—placing the cost of the requisite improvements at 560,000*l.* for new works, and 331,000*l.* for

armament. The stations and works recommended were as follow:—

	Works £	Armament £
Aden	94,000	34,000
Ceylon	25,000	30,000
Colombo	20,820	25,000
Singapore	75,000	49,000
Hong Kong	55,625	37,500
Sierra Leone	30,000	22,000
St. Helena	7,000	—
Cape of Good Hope { Simon's Bay	60,000	29,000
{ Table Bay .	76,875	37,000
Mauritius	55,000	34,000
Jamaica	31,250	25,000
St. Lucia	30,000	18,000

These recommendations, after discussion by the Colonial and War Offices, were forwarded to the Treasury, where they met with a somewhat cold reception; and although a promise was given to provide one-half (64,000*l.*) of the sum required for Aden, the matter was temporarily laid aside, on the ground that until the earthworks were ready to receive the guns it was premature to ask Parliament to provide money for the latter. The anxiety, however, which had arisen with regard to the navy soon extended itself to the state of our coaling stations, and a few months later (November 8) the Treasury admitted that “in the present development of gun-making it will not be possible to defer all expenditure on armament until the works are completed.” After a long correspondence with the Indian Government it was ultimately agreed that in the course of the year ending March 31, 1885, the Treasury would sanction the expenditure of 30,000*l.* out of imperial funds.

Under such circumstances it was impossible that Lord Carnarvon's remonstrance could be regarded otherwise than as a grave charge against the Government, either of neglect of obvious duties, or of inability to understand the gravity of the situation. Dealing only with such papers as had been made public, and carefully avoiding all allusion to the secret proceedings of the Royal Commission, Lord Carnarvon showed that the apparent aim of the Government had been to eliminate one after another the various parts referred to by the Royal Commission and endorsed by the Inspector-General of Fortifications as needing immediate care, until only Aden, Singapore, and Hong Kong remained, where an expenditure of 347,000*l.* (as compared with 891,000*l.* pronounced necessary) would be ultimately sanctioned. Lord Carnarvon, admitting that the four great stations of Gibraltar, Malta, Bermuda, and Halifax, “the maritime quadrilateral of England,” might be in the state of preparation for attack which was asserted, declined to admit that the new Government plan was adequate in what it proposed to do for the rest of our coaling stations, and for the security of our mercantile navy and com-

merce abroad. He held that we could not expect the colonies to provide all our colonial defences. All we could look to them for in this matter of defence was co-operation.

Lord Northbrook's defence of his Government was received even by its adherents with something like dismay. Adopting from the outset an optimist tone, and refusing to acknowledge that there had been either neglect or delay on the part of the departments concerned, he assured the House that the Government were alive to the importance of duly protecting our coaling stations, and that they intended to fortify those stations in a manner which they believed would be adequate. He went through the Government proposals to show that they were founded on the best professional judgment, and on the advice of those who were responsible for the stations to be defended. He mentioned that it was a great mistake to suppose that the armaments proposed by the Government were to be of light guns. They would be of much heavier guns than those recommended by the Royal Commission.

The Duke of Cambridge, in the double capacity of commander-in-chief and chairman of the Departmental Committee, suggested that the proposals now before Parliament and the public were only a part of the whole scheme of the Government, who, he presumed, would carry out, as far as possible, the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners. So far as they had gone, the Government were carrying out those recommendations, with such modifications as had been rendered desirable by the increase in the calibre of guns.

After some further discussion the subject was allowed to drop, to be resumed in a different form at a subsequent period.

Another question of importance brought before Parliament, and immediately connected with the defence of our colonies, was the state of the navy. The conditions under which the agitation had been started have been already explained, and it was satisfactory to note that almost as soon as Parliament had met, the official apologists of the Admiralty had either admitted the force of the criticism levelled at the navy, or, like the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had expressed satisfaction that public attention had been aroused. The charges brought against the Admiralty were that the navy—at least in ironclads—was being hard pressed by France; that our guns, in number and calibre, were infinitely inferior to hers; that our stock of ammunition was lamentably scanty; that of swift, heavily armed, but unarmoured cruisers, capable of steaming sixteen knots an hour, only two were ready for sea; that the whole torpedo navy had to be constructed. All these defects and deficiencies were permitted to exist in presence of a commerce which had increased nearly thirty per cent. in the last fifteen years. In 1868, when our mercantile shipping tonnage was about five and a half millions, we expended on our navy as much as France, Germany, Italy, and Russia together. In 1883

those Powers had augmented their naval expenditure by four millions, whilst we had reduced ours by 850,000l.; and in the matter of manning the navy, our sailors, which in 1868 were reckoned at 67,120, had fallen to 59,250, whilst in France they had been increased from 42,000 to 66,000 during the same interval. These and many cognate charges against the Admiralty were endorsed by experts and recognised authorities irrespective of party. Furthermore it was openly asserted, and never contradicted, that for years the professional advisers of the department had been urging reforms and additions which the civil lords or the Treasury had met by an unvarying veto, on the ground that reduced estimates were the first consideration.

It was, therefore, with no small impatience that the public listened to the various excuses given for the delay of the promised statement of the Government. At one time it was rumoured that the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord Northbrook) was prepared to resign rather than admit that the comfortable assurances he had given in the summer would not bear closer investigation; and at another it was asserted that the Treasury still refused to approve of any further vote being taken, in spite of the strong representations of the Admiralty. In some measure these doubts were cleared away by the simultaneous statements made in the two Houses (December 2). Lord Northbrook began by assuring the House of Lords that the present Government had been alive to the great importance of upholding the naval strength of the country. He referred to figures to show that the tonnage of ships in construction had greatly increased since 1880. Having recapitulated details given to the public when this year's Navy Estimates were presented to the House of Commons, to show what was doing in the way of construction and refitting, he passed to what the Government proposed to do, and stated that this would cost 3,100,000l. in addition to the ordinary estimates of the year. One ironclad would be added to the three ships of that class which had already been decided upon; there would be a large addition to our torpedo boats, and five large cruisers would be built for additional protection to our maritime commerce. The extraordinary works would extend over a period of five years. Tenders would be invited for the building by private firms of certain of the new ships which it was proposed to construct. The increased expenditure proposed on the navy would come before the committee of the House of Commons on naval and military expenditure which was to be appointed next session. In conclusion, he mentioned that the increase in the power of guns made it necessary that the defence of our forts should be considered with reference to that increase. It might be that the Secretary for War would have some proposal to make on the subject, but he thought it right to intimate that if much of the additional defence of those forts should fall on the navy, the present proposals of the Admiralty might have to be increased. At the close of the discus-

sion, in reply to the various remarks made by other peers, Lord Northbrook took occasion to say that the delay in supplying guns to the ships was not owing to any shortcoming at Woolwich, but to the change from muzzle-loaders to breech-loaders not having been commenced soon enough. He also explained that, though he had named five years for the completion of the additional new vessels, he had not meant it to be understood that most of them would not be completed within a shorter time.

In the House of Commons the Secretary to the Admiralty (Sir Thomas Brassey) went at much greater length into a comparative examination of the English and French navies, and expressed great satisfaction at having an opportunity of substituting accurate facts for imperfect information, on which the criticism to which the Admiralty had been subjected was founded. He declared that in the matter of ironclads of the most modern type, the English navy would in the ensuing year comprise 30 ships of 210,430 tons, as compared with the French 19 ships of 127,828; while of *quasi*-obsolete ships we should have 16, of 115,520 tons, and the French 12, of 53,066. The English navy would have five large turret-ships, and the French 3. All our more recent ships had an estimated speed of 16 knots, and the armament had been increased to 45-ton guns, 63-ton guns (more powerful than any gun now being constructed for a foreign navy), and even to 110 tons. As to unarmoured ships, we had 33 ships in course of completion, of 89,650 tons, of over 13 knots speed; and he described also the improvements in the speed and armament of the cruiser class. As to the torpedo class, he admitted that we had not made the same progress as some foreign countries, but he pointed out that they were only available for coast defences, and were not sea-keeping vessels. The policy of the present Board, he said, had always been to increase the construction of ironclads and to expedite completion. For that purpose they had increased the shipbuilding vote; but, looking to the progress which had been made by foreign Powers, the Admiralty felt that they had no choice but to ask Parliament for an increased vote, with the view of affording adequate protection to our immense commerce. For this purpose it was proposed to lay down new ironclads of the first class, to augment our force of belted cruisers, and to create a torpedo flotilla. In addition to the sum taken in the current estimates a total amount of 3,085,000*l.* was proposed to be expended on contract work, and for this sum of money it was estimated that there would be produced one ironclad of the first class, five belted cruisers, two torpedo rams, ten "Scouts," and 30 torpedo boats, of which ten would be given out every year. This formed part of a general programme by which the Admiralty, in addition to the estimates of the current year, proposed to lay down four first-class ironclads, two in the dockyards and two by contract, each with two 110-ton guns in a turret, besides a broadside armament with 18-inch armour and a speed of 15½ knots. Three belted

cruisers also would be commenced under contract, and two in the dockyards; ten modified "Scouts" would be ordered, and a certain number of torpedo boats. In addition to this, the ships now in progress in the dockyards would be pushed forward with all economical rapidity, and the programme for the year 1885-6 would be increased to 29,810 tons. He then explained the proposals for the defence of our coaling stations. On the first-class stations it was proposed to spend 976,871*l.*, of which India and the colonies would subscribe 330,000*l.*, and on the second-class 158,000*l.* It was also proposed to take measures for the protection of our commercial harbours, and an increased expenditure of 1,600,000*l.*, in addition to the present estimates, was contemplated on naval ordnance. The total extra expenditure contemplated he estimated at 3,100,000*l.* for shipbuilding, 1,600,000*l.* for naval ordnance, and 825,000*l.* for coaling stations, to be extended over five years. This cheerful statement was, however, not received with very enthusiastic approval. Nor were the proposals of the Government regarded as an adequate reply to public expectation. Mr. W. H. Smith, speaking on behalf of the Conservatives, complained that everything seemed to be deferred to the next and four following years; and asked why, since the existing deficiency in our navy had been formally recognised, immediate steps were not taken to remedy it. On the Liberal side of the House, Sir D. Currie maintained that we were not able to hold our own in ships, guns, and men against any combination of foreign Powers; and Sir E. J. Reed strenuously urged the need of greater efficiency in naval construction in order to place our ships on a level with those of other countries. The defence of the Government was undertaken by Mr. Trevelyan and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the former of whom denied that the Admiralty had changed its policy; it had only enlarged it. He did not agree that there was any cause for alarm; and in regard to France he pointed out that, while she had laid down four ironclads since 1881, we had laid down eight, besides the four now announced. In the same way he maintained we were superior in regard to fast cruisers, and denied that there was any reason to apprehend a deficiency of men.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer addressed himself more especially to the financial side of the Government proposals, explaining that, of the 3,100,000*l.* to be spent on shipbuilding, 800,000*l.* would come into course of payment during the next year, in addition to the ordinary estimates; similarly, 400,000*l.* of the 1,600,000*l.* would be spent on ordnance during the same period. The expenditure of 825,000*l.* on our coaling stations would be spread over five years. He defended the Admiralty against the charge of yielding to panic, by arguing that the expansion now given to shipbuilding was entirely consistent with the policy which they laid down on entering upon office.

In nearly all quarters the Government answer to the popular

demand was pronounced inadequate. Nevertheless, there arose a few anti-alarmists or sceptics, who declared that the outcry in the newspapers was chiefly, if not wholly, the work of the professional advisers of the Admiralty, assisted in a great measure by the large shipbuilders whose yards were empty, and whose trade was temporarily at a standstill. Had only patriotic sentiments inspired the official agitators for an increased naval expenditure, they might, it was said, more easily have placed the case between themselves and their Parliamentary representatives before the public by resigning in a body; whilst, again, if the parsimony of the Treasury had been the obstacle to the united opinion of the Admiralty Board, an appeal to the nation would have settled the respective value of the two policies. In view, therefore, of such considerations, anything like a sweeping condemnation of Lord Northbrook's indifference, or of Sir T. Brassey's misplaced optimism, was to be deprecated.

The adjournment (December 5) for a long and well-earned holiday was not, as had so frequently been the case, the signal for the continuance of the Parliamentary struggle on provincial platforms. Both parties desired a truce, and during the remainder of the year silence was scarcely broken by any prominent statesman of either party. At Brighton (December 9) Mr. G. Trevelyan, the author of Household Franchise in the Counties, received a warm reception, and in the course of his speech expressed his belief that with an extended electorate politics would become less feverish; and Sir C. Dilke, at Aylesbury (December 10), defended the principle of single seats. Sir John Lubbock and Mr. Courtney started upon a "mission" throughout the northern counties in favour of proportional representation. The application of Mr. Hare's suggestion was that which, after due discussion in Prince's Hall (December 15), it was decided to advocate; on the ground that, under the scheme of single seats and subdivided constituencies, it would be possible for a minority of the whole electorate to obtain a majority in the greater number of constituencies. To avert or avoid this change something akin to the French *scrutin de liste* was proposed by the champions of proportional representation, by which it was asserted that not only would the minority enjoy ample protection, but the majority would make its wishes felt without the risk attendant upon the existing system, in which a popular candidate not unfrequently obtained far more votes than were requisite to ensure his election, whilst colleagues of identical views were defeated by a candidate who represented a distinct minority of the constituency. At Manchester, where a test ballot was taken, Sir J. Lubbock, Mr. Courtney, and others failed to convince the audience; but amongst the miners of South Northumberland, and subsequently in the neighbourhood of Glasgow, test elections were held on the proportional representative system with marked results.

The Colonial Office shared with the Foreign Office an unenviable

prominence in irritating the German Government. The news that the German flag had been hoisted on the northern coast of New Guinea was followed by that of the annexation of New Britain and New Ireland; and a few days later Prince Bismarck gave to the world the official history of the four years of neglect and procrastination on the part of the Colonial Office which had led to the forcible annexation of Angra Pequena on the south-west coast of Africa. By the former act Australian indignation was raised to the highest pitch, in view of the possible revival and extension of the system of penal settlements near their coasts; and the good-will of the same colonies was not in any way regained when it was found that Lord Derby, in his anxiety to avoid the responsibility of bringing New Guinea under British rule, had delayed until Germany had established herself on one long line of its coasts.

In his history of his dealings with the Foreign Office, Prince Bismarck proved, to his own satisfaction, that throughout the negotiations England had had two distinct policies. At one moment Lord Granville waived all claim to sovereign and other rights beyond the Orange River, but no sooner did Germany attempt to profit by this repudiation than Lord Granville declared that any encroachment on the unclaimed territory was to ignore our legitimate rights. After four years of procrastination and indecision, Lord Granville found it more convenient to leave unanswered Prince Bismarck's despatches, and the result was the summary annexation of the districts in dispute in a fashion which could only be humiliating to our national pride.

The simultaneous demand (December 11) of Germany and Russia to be represented on the Commission of the Egyptian Debt was further evidence of the hostility with which our foreign policy was regarded by the Continental Powers, whilst it suggested at the same time the marked desire of Germany to show herself acting in support of, or in concert with, France. The adhesion of Russia to the European Concert, from which England was thus ostentatiously excluded, was taken as a proof that that country had agreed for the time to forego her intrigues in Eastern Europe in order to prosecute a more active policy in Southern Asia, and to advance another stage towards Herat and the Afghan frontier. The year, in fact, was closing gloomily for this country, compassed about with troubles in all quarters of the globe, and finding but scant sympathy even amongst the scattered members of her own family, whose aspirations had been thwarted, and their feelings wounded. The one bright spot seemed to be the Soudan, where, on the last day of the year, Sir Herbert Stewart and General Earle were starting on their march across the desert in order to rescue the *preux chevalier* of modern type, who for ten months had, by his energy and influence, held in check the Mahdi and forces of militant Islam under the walls of Khartoum.

FOREIGN HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

FRANCE AND ITALY.

FRANCE.

THE Reforming Chamber, the finest name in the world, according to the expression, perhaps slightly ironical, of M. Ferry—the Reforming Chamber left an unusual amount of business in arrear at the end of the session of 1883. Owing to the slowness with which the budget debates were conducted, the extraordinary expenditure still remained to be passed by the Senate. The new Municipal Law, in spite of its urgency, being at a standstill, and the old one of 1874 virtually abrogated, the Government was obliged to defer the elections. This course gave rise to vehement protests, especially on the part of the Paris Council, the extreme parties of which never miss an opportunity of calling attention to the faults of Parliament. On New Year's Day a protest of the members of the Right, drafted by M. Hervé, was printed in all the monarchical newspapers, and posted in certain quarters of Paris. This demonstration passed almost unnoticed, as did the gatherings at the Orleans railway station on the occasion of the departure of the Comte de Paris for a tour in the south. The *ban* and the *arrière-ban* of the Royalist Union of Paris had been called out to give an imposing character to this royal departure. The police, informed of the intention, contented themselves with closing the gates leading to the platform, and three arrests sufficed to balk a sufficiently childish design. The princes' hour for action had not yet struck.

The extreme Left of the Municipal Council could not allow itself to be outdone by the Royalists in zeal for the rights of Paris. Accordingly, its members issued a manifesto threatening that they would resign *en masse* in order to compel the Government to proceed at once to the elections. But, as it was soon perceived that the result of such a step would be to give an easy majority to the opportunist Republicans, it was speedily renounced by almost all the members.

The most important protest was that of M. Carnot, who, having to open the session as Vice-President of the Senate, took that opportunity of expressing his regret that that assembly had not been invited earlier to contribute its share of learning to the

settlement of the financial law. The spirit in which his words were received showed this influential party leader to be in complete agreement with his followers. M. Jules Ferry, impressed by the unanimous protest of such widely differing sections, promised to hasten the progress of affairs in 1884.

At the opening of the ordinary session the Chamber of Deputies was occupied with a Bill for including the cost of the Prefecture of Police in the State budget. Officially, the Préfet de Police is the subordinate of the Préfet de la Seine, and, by consequence, of the Minister of the Interior. But the chief expenses of this important service are borne by the local budget of the city of Paris. On the strength of this the Municipal Council claimed the right to control its administration, and the Préfet de Police has been several times cited before the Municipal Council. Votes of want of confidence have been passed upon him, only to be ultimately vetoed by the President of the Republic. In the public discussion of the question the further point was raised whether the Prefecture of Police should exercise extra-judicial functions. As the law stands the Commissaires de Police institute the practical inquiries into all crimes and offences committed in Paris and its suburbs, with a view to the acceleration of justice; but, according to Article 10 of the Code of Criminal Instructions, the agents of the Prefecture have alone the right to draw up accusations and to make arrests. In theory their power stops at this point, the next step being to lay the case before the magistrates; in fact, it often happens that the reports are kept at the Prefecture and arrive very late at the office of the Public Prosecutor, or they do not arrive at all; the police usurping the authority of the judges, and pursuing or arranging the case without reference to the magistracy. An amendment named by M. Goblet (a former Minister of the Interior), with a view to checking this abuse, was negatived by 260 votes against 224; and at the sitting of January 21 the Bill for including the budget of the Prefecture of Police in that of the State was carried by 284 votes against 213. But the Bill was never brought on for a second reading, and consequently never reached the Senate. The members of the Extreme Left, and a part of the Radical Left, discovered in the industrial crisis another platform on which to attack the Ministry. On January 30, upon an interpellation of M. Langlois, a general discussion was opened on the subject of industrial grievances in Paris and the principal manufacturing centres of France. M. Jules Ferry tried to avoid debate by moving the previous question, commenting on the principle that on such matters Government is bound to remain neutral, and by warning the Chamber against doctrines of State socialism. M. Brousse and M. Clémenceau, members of the Extreme Left, protested energetically against the indifference of the wealthy classes. The speech of M. Clémenceau was one of the most concise and energetic that the chief of the Extreme Left had ever pronounced; for, doubtless knowing himself to be in

danger from the jealousies of his own colleagues, he seized this opportunity to prove that his claim to be their leader was above dispute. In spite of the formal opposition of the Prime Minister, the Chamber carried the Bill for the nomination of a Committee of Inquiry by 284 votes against 249. The Commission was to consist of forty-four members, but in deference to the wishes of the Ministry, instead of being elected by the whole Chamber in open session, four members were chosen from each of the eleven *bureaux*; an arrangement with which the Radicals had, as it proved, reason to be dissatisfied.

The Commission at once summoned the principal employers of labour in Paris, invited reports from the syndical chambers, consulted experts of all kinds, and in a word, opened an inquiry as comprehensive as it was unsystematic into the whole field of commerce, enterprise, and industry in Paris. Naturally the most contradictory results were obtained, and the most singular theories were aired. In consequence, moreover, of the strikes at Anzin and Denain, delegates were sent to the North, and into the basin of St. Etienne and to Lyons, to collect statistics as to their causes. Lyons, it was found, demanded that the thread silk necessary to its trade, and chiefly derived from the manufactories of England, Germany, and Italy, should be exempted from import duties, and subjected to the *régime* of temporary admission. Immediately the weavers of Lille and Roubaix protested that this measure would be the ruin of their industry. In short, equally contradictory results were obtained in Paris and in the provinces, and this attempt at State intervention for the relief of the industrial crisis was at length recognised to have ended in checkmate. It was conclusively shown that a Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry was incapable not only of devising remedies, but of discovering the true causes of commercial distress. None the less, the demand of the Minister of Finance (February 12) for a loan of thirteen millions of francs, for funding of the floating debt, met with a ready response, and in spite of some mismanagement on the part of the administration which discouraged a great many holders of small incomes, the public subscribed in one day a sum total of 624 millions of francs (15,605,000*l.*) On the 24th of the same month, the Bill relating to Trades' Unions was passed by the Senate, after long deliberations marked by important speeches from MM. Jules Simon, Buffet, and Waldeck-Rousseau, Minister of the Interior. By this law these associations for the first time obtained legal recognition, and with it the right to receive legacies and make donations, on condition of submitting their statutes to the State authorities.

The Senate then turned to the discussion of Municipal Law. A Bill was brought in divided into two parts; the first, concerning the organisation of all the communes of Paris, excepting Paris itself, gave rise to no incident of note. The Republican party were unanimously in favour of giving more independence to the

communes, and the Royalists, counting on getting majorities in a great many municipal councils and on keeping their position in the west of France, approved of a measure which, failing the general control of the country, gave them, at least, authority in their own districts. The application of the second part of the Bill was restricted to the capital. Paris is divided into twenty arrondissements, each of which is subdivided into four sections. Each section elects one municipal councillor. The result is a very great inequality in the numbers of the electors. For instance, the quarter of La Santé, in the south of the city, has less than 7,000 inhabitants, whilst the quarter of Clignancourt in the north has more than 77,000. In the one a councillor is elected by 501 votes, in the other by 5,526. These differences are shocking to the Frenchmen of to-day. Moreover, the one-member system as applied to the municipal elections is peculiar to Paris: in all the rest of France the municipal councillors are elected by the *scrutin de liste*. This system, however, works badly on the whole, for the greater number of the elected are politicians chosen by anonymous committees, belonging with a few exceptions to extreme parties. The average elector seldom has a moderate candidate to support, and the number of abstentions is therefore considerable. It was proposed by the Opportunists to divide Paris into four or five large sections, of which each should elect about twenty councillors.

When the Bill had passed the Senate and had come back to the Chamber of Deputies, an amendment was introduced, defining these sections. On the 7th of April the Bill as amended was returned to the Upper House. MM. Labiche and Léon Say brought forward an entirely new provision by which each arrondissement became an electoral unit, and elected councillors by *scrutin de liste*, according to the number of its population. This amendment was adopted by 138 votes against 125. But by an unexpected revulsion, when all the clauses of the Bill had been passed separately in committee, the final motion that the Bill as amended should pass, was rejected. The *status quo* was therefore maintained, and the municipal elections of the 4th and 11th of May were held in the ordinary way.

The result of these elections, which took place on the same day in Paris and in all France, was not favourable to the Government. In Paris 34 autonomists were returned, 2 socialists, 11 reactionists, and 33 opportunists. It was evident, therefore, that the ediles of Paris would tend, more than ever, to transform the Hôtel de Ville into a Parliament House, and to occupy themselves with general politics rather than with the affairs of the capital and the administration of the municipal budget. In the provinces the event was not less mortifying for the Opportunist party. For the first time since 1872 the Royalists gained ground. They were completely victorious in Loire Inférieure, and in every department they conquered new rural communes. This unexpected

success was due to the new organisation of the Royalist party and to other general causes. The noisy but ineffectual protests of the *légitimistes intransigeants*, the quarrel raging between the partisans of the elder branch of the Bourbons, who went so far as to propose the title of Pretender to Don Carlos, and afterwards to his son, Don Jaimé, the intrigues of what is called the party of Anjou—all these were in truth little more than a show got up to amuse the spectators and provoke the *lazzi* of the mob.

But there was serious work being done quietly. With the greatest possible prudence, and in such a manner as to avoid compromising themselves at any point, the chiefs of the Orleanist party (which had been completely reconstituted in the winter of 1883-84) had begun to create in the provinces a network of propagandist committees. The rural proprietors, noble or non-noble, were counted upon to supply the mainstay of the army. In every department a newspaper was started, and supported by the subscriptions of the committee, or at the voluntary cost of the principal agents of the departments. The programme of the propaganda was—

1. Peace abroad, and renunciation of a colonial policy.
2. Reform of the Budget, and reduction of military expenditure; a realisable proposal so soon as France, renouncing the Republican form of government, should be again admitted into the European family, and there find allies.
3. Protection of agriculture by the imposition of import duties on foreign cattle and cereals.

The plan of this campaign was settled before the months of July and August, during which the chief agricultural meetings are held, and the way was in this fashion paved for the interpellation of the Government on the meeting of the Chambers in October. Finally, the Agricultural Society of France, at its November meeting, held under the presidency of the Marquis de Dampière, formulated a petition for the restoration of compensatory rights, and for a return pure and simple to protectionist principles. In contrast to the Royalists, who, though universally weak, were gaining strength by their cohesion, the Republican party during the year found itself more and more divided, and liable upon all essential questions to the outbreak of quarrels which had grown more bitter since the previous session.

The first meeting of the Chamber took place on May 20. The Order Book was crowded with business, so that, apart from unexpected questions which might give rise to interpellations, and waste two or three sittings in violent and even scandalous debates, the session promised to be a long one. The business set down comprised an Army Organisation Bill, the creation of a Colonial Army, the Revision of the Constitution, and the Budget.

The Army Organisation Bill had been for several years in preparation. Gambetta, after his fall, had presided over a Committee appointed to draw it up. Since the death of

patriot, the work had advanced but slowly, and it was several times proposed to make a separate Bill of so much as related to the formation of a colonial army. The most propitious moment for this step would have been in May or June 1883, after which the budget difficulties made the constitution of an independent colonial army almost impossible. At length the clauses relating to recruits, forming the preamble of the Bill, were placed at the head of the orders of the day. In the course of the debates which ensued, the dissensions of the Republican party were strongly accentuated. The Ministerial majority in the group of the Republican Union (commonly called the Great U) split itself into numerous fragments. The greater number of the deputies were in the main faithful to the Ferry Cabinet, but a small handful of dissentients, of whom the leaders were M. Paul Bert (former Minister of Public Instruction) and M. Allain Targé (former Minister of Finance in the Gambetta Cabinet), began a campaign, of which the plan was to humble and efface the Government by conducting the army debates independently of the Ministry. In order to attain his end, M. Paul Bert declared himself in favour of reducing the term of military service, and making enlistment compulsory upon all valid Frenchmen, without exception. The principle of compulsion without exception was supported by the distinguished *savant* with inexhaustible spirit, and this debate and that on the Revision of the Constitution were the two great events of the summer session.

The proposal of a three years' term of military service has met in France with three classes of determined enemies. The first are military men, who believe it to be impossible to have an efficient army under this system. They contend especially that it would be impossible in so short a time to train the required number of non-commissioned officers, and that without good sergeants there can be no army. The second class are men who object to three years' barrack life being imposed upon students graduating for professional careers. *Le Temps*, the organ of the most moderate section of the Opportunists, published a very remarkable series of articles in the interests of public education, declaring that every department of intellectual culture would be killed by this rule of absolute equality. M. Paul Bert held his ground with obstinate determination, and ultimately carried with him the majority of the Chamber, and even divided the Ministry. The Minister for War, General Camponon, joined the partisans of the three years' service, and maintained that the young men of education who under the present system only spend one year in barracks as volunteers, would supply the army with subalterns of the kind it needed most. The Minister of Public Instruction took the opposite view, and an awkward crisis seemed inevitable. To avert this, M. Durand moved an amendment, by which the pupils of the superior Government Schools—l'Ecole Normale, l'Ecole Forestière, l'Ecole Polytechnique—should be authorised to serve only

one year in the regiments, on condition that military training were made a part of their regular school course. But it was in his character of deputy and not as Under Secretary of Public Instruction that M. Durand moved his amendment. The Government ostensibly held itself aloof, and the amendment was rejected. Monseigneur Freppel, Bishop of Angers, in like manner, naively demanded a dispensation for theological students nominated by the bishops and archbishops, and finally clause 38, which summed up the whole measure, and fixed the term of service at three years, was carried by 423 votes against 48. The partisans of universal compulsory service seemed to have triumphed. But this crushing majority was at best illusory. It was evident that even should the Chamber read the Bill a second time before its dissolution, the Senate would not have time to examine the Bill, and the next Parliament would have to go over the ground again from the beginning.

Financial affairs, moreover, were causing a more widespread uneasiness, and the feeling that the Budget would not be able to bear the enormous expenses resulting from the incorporation of the entire military contingent, daily gained strength. An amendment of M. Margaigne, carried by 267 votes against 144, had certainly stipulated that in time of peace, the breadwinners in families—that is to say—sons of widows, eldest brothers of orphaned families, and those who supported their relations by their labour, should be exempted from service. But this clause opened the way to arbitrary distinctions, and gave deputies and senators and influential members of electoral committees an opportunity of obliging their friends. Finally, by imposing on students of the Ecole Polytechnique three years' regimental service as privates or non-commissioned officers, the Bill incurred the enmity of the most powerful of all the associations of France, and that which has the strongest *esprit de corps*. M. Paul Bert had asked that the two years of school time should be counted as one year of service, and by denying this privilege, the Chamber all but shipwrecked the Bill: at all events, it relegated to next year a reform it had declared to be especially urgent.

The debate on the Revision of the Constitution occupied the remainder of the session. M. Jules Ferry had promised in the previous session to bring in a Bill embodying a Revision of the Constitution before the expiration of the Parliament, reserving to himself the choice of the moment. Gambetta had been thrown out of office because he wanted to force upon the Chambers the *scrutin de liste*, and the principle of partial revision, chiefly on the pretext that to vote the *scrutin de liste* in the first session would be to prepare the way for a speedy dissolution. On the other hand, a Chamber near the close of its term wants the authority necessary to the making of so radical a change. This gave the Senate courage, in 1881, to reject the *scrutin de liste* in spite of its being demanded by a majority of the Chamber.

According to the Constitution, revision could only be effected legally when both Chambers declared separately that the occasion justified the convocation of the National Assembly. The National Assembly, more commonly spoken of as the Congress, consists of all the members of the Senate (300), and of the Chamber of Deputies (569), presided over by the President of the former, and assembled at Versailles, so that the Senators in Congress have no longer the same importance as when sitting as a separate body. The Republican majority of this Assembly was composed of an Extreme Left, numbering five or six members, *l'Union républicaine*, consisting of about fifty, the Republican Left of about seventy-five, and the Left Centre of about forty. The Left Centre, however, was split up into two groups, of which Léon Say and Jules Simon were the respective chiefs. The section of which the latter was the leader had often of late allied itself with the sections of the Right under the title of "*les dissidents*," so that in the Senate, as formerly in the National Assembly, the Centre held the balance between the Left and the Right. The Senate required, therefore, to be satisfied as to what would be the consequences of its vote, before it would declare that a meeting of the National Assembly was necessary. Accordingly M. Jules Ferry promised that either the Revision should be partial, or that there should be no Revision at all, and by his advice the Chamber rejected (June 24) an amendment of M. Barodet, by which the Revision would have been made integral. The Radicals joined themselves to the divisions of the Right, and brought forward several motions, of which the most important and the most warmly supported was the counter-proposal of MM. Goblet and Floquet. The Government made this a Cabinet question, and after a severe struggle it was rejected by the Chamber, by 283 votes against 229. M. Bernard Lavergne of the Radical Left then (July 1) proposed that the Senate should be elected by universal suffrage, and his amendment was only lost by 265 against 235, but at length the entire Government Bill was adopted (July 3) by 414 votes against 113.

By this means the Senate became master of the situation, and it need hardly be said their decision was taken behind the scenes, and not in open debate. The Chamber had passed a Bill by which Revision was restricted to a small number of points, but the members of the Extreme Left declared notwithstanding that they had only consented to the Government scheme because for them the essential thing was to go to Versailles. Once assembled, the Congress was supreme, and the majority would be able to break all trammels by which it had been hampered in anticipation. The Senators who belonged to the majority, fearing to fall into a trap, demanded that solid guarantees should be given them, and M. Jules Ferry undertook that the Chamber should debate and pass a resolution, engaging itself not to discuss in Congress any other points than those prescribed by the Government. But in the course of some preliminary interviews with leaders of the

Parliamentary parties and with the Revision Committee, M. Jules Ferry found that it was impossible to get the Chamber to make such an engagement collectively. All he could obtain was a written engagement to support the Government programme, signed by the members of the Republican Union and the Democratic Union, together a clear majority of the deputies.

It was no easy matter to persuade the Senate to accept these private engagements in lieu of the collective vote of the Chamber. M. Jules Ferry, however, succeeded in convincing the senators that the time had come for suppressing those Articles of the Constitution which had so keenly offended the Republican party in 1875. The principal argument was that if the Revision were successfully effected at a moment when the country was quiet and no revolution was to be feared, public opinion would be satisfied with a very few concessions, and it would be easy afterwards to withstand the demands of extreme parties. If, on the other hand, the Senate refused to go to Versailles, complaint would be unanimous in the Republican party, a formidable agitation would follow, and it would still be necessary to summon the Congress later, and under much less favourable circumstances. These representations carried the day. The Senatorial Commission, nominated on July 8, consisted of eighteen members—nine of them absolutely hostile to the projected meeting of the Congress, nine in favour of partial Revision.

After much debate and negotiation the two Chambers agreed upon a scheme, of which the leading feature was the suppression of the right of the Senate to vote the Budget or to interfere with its appropriation.

Accordingly on August 4 the National Assembly, presided over by M. Leroyer, met at Versailles, and after nine sittings this measure of Partial Revision was carried. The first resolution taken by the Assembly was to follow the precedents of 1871, excepting only the right of secret voting. It was next decided that a Commission should be appointed to examine the proposed reforms in the constitutional law; the Committee to consist of thirty members, to be nominated from the Tribune, and chosen by open vote. On the question being put, M. Madier de Montjau read a declaration on behalf of the Extreme Left, stating that that section of the Chamber would abstain from voting. It was hoped by this means to make the deliberations impossible, for as the President admitted a few days subsequently 429 votes were necessary to a legal majority on the preliminary question, that is to say, the half plus one of the total number of deputies and of senators present or absent. In spite of this opposition and much violent speaking, the Committee was formally appointed, and met at once to consider the Government Bill, and the various amendments proposed. It chose as its reporter M. Gerville Réache, a young deputy of negro blood, who had been elected for Guadeloupe, under the patronage of M. Clémenceau, but had gradually, since

1881, been drawing nearer to M. Ferry's Government. The general report was read in open debate on August 6, and the reading was the occasion of violent scenes. M. Clémenceau several times interpellated his former protégé. Language became as violent as in the first sitting. But from this moment it became possible, if not to establish order in the Assembly, at least to get on with the business for which the Congress had met. It was decided, in order to save time, that during the general discussion no one should reply, either in the name of the Commission or in that of the Government, to the arguments of the minority. Accordingly by August 8 it was possible to pass to the discussion of separate clauses. It had been agreed that all amendments, without exception, should be referred to the Commission, and that all those which were rejected by the Commission should be met by the "previous question;" that is to say, that the Assembly should refuse to discuss them. In this way the Barodet amendment, which asked for the convocation of a constituent Assembly, thus exposing the form of government to the danger of constant revision, was set aside by a majority of 493 against 286, and the ineligibility for the Presidency of the members of families that had reigned over France, by a majority of 592 against 148. The powers of the Obstructionists being at length exhausted, the Revision Bill, as a whole, was carried (August 12) by a majority of 509 against 149, and with an evident sense of relief M. Leroyer declared the National Assembly dissolved.

The results of the Congress were thus exceedingly meagre. The Article prohibiting Revision to meddle with the Republican form of the Government was not sufficient to disarm the opposition of the Extreme Left, whose leaders resolved to "stump" the country in favour of the convocation of a constituent Assembly. The Bonapartists, on the other hand, protested beforehand against the decisions of the Congress, and on the very eve of its meeting Prince Jerome Napoleon issued a manifesto which, unlike its predecessor of 1883, was received with contemptuous indifference, whilst the Royalists contented themselves with protesting through their organs of the press.

The question of the reform of the Senate next occupied public attention. This body, composed of 300 members, was somewhat anomalously constituted. Three-quarters of its members were elected for nine years by the departments, whilst the remaining quarter, that chosen by co-optation among the senators themselves, held their seats for life. The law of 1875 had allotted to each commune the right of sending one delegate to the electoral body, by which the nine years' senator for each department was chosen. In this way an insignificant village, Morteau (Haute-Marne), with fifteen inhabitants, had its delegate equally with Paris, with 2,269,000. On August 16 M. Martin Feuillée, Minister of Justice, laid before the Senate, in the name of the Government, a scheme for the remedy of

ly. The

Senate, immediately upon its meeting in October, took the Government proposal into consideration, and consented to do away altogether with life members, on condition that the reform was not retrospective. It was also decided that the number of delegates nominated by the Municipal or Commune Councils should be augmented in proportion to population. The Bill, after being adopted by the Senate, was sent to the Chamber of Deputies, who discussed it in the beginning of December. On December 2, on the motion of M. Floquet, the Chamber adopted, by 267 votes against 250, the proposition that "Senators shall be elected by *scrutin de liste*, by direct and universal suffrage." This decision struck at the very root of the Government Bill, and was equivalent to a formal rupture with the Senate. The Minister of the Interior, M. Waldeck-Rousseau, sent in his resignation, but the President refused to accept it, and the Chamber, dreading the consequences of a ministerial crisis, showed a disposition to compromise. The mutilated scheme was sent back to the Senate, who restored it to its original form, and returned it to the Chamber of Deputies. M. Floquet once more brought forward his amendment, but was defeated by 280 votes against 227, and the law was finally accepted by the Chamber with 336 votes against 174. The new Bill, as passed, did away with all distinctions among the senators, who will henceforth be chosen by the departments or the colonies; members of families who have reigned in France are ineligible; and the electoral bodies (*collèges*) are modified so that the Municipal Council of Paris elects thirty delegates, councils comprised of thirty-six members and more elect twenty-four, and all others in the proportion of two electors to three members of council. In virtue of this law the municipal councils of the departments were resolved to meet on December 21 to elect new delegates in those cases where the sitting senator's term of office had expired. But in this again the slowness of parliamentary procedure had driven the Government into an irregularity. According to law it was on Sunday, January 4, that the election of senators should have taken place, whereas it was not possible for the electoral colleges to meet before January 28, 1885. So that the year 1884, which had been behindhand with all its measures, bequeathed a month's arrears to its successor.

The most important vote of this year, however, that which re-established divorce in France, was rather social than political. M. Naquet, during his career in the Chamber of Deputies, had piloted through that body a Bill which abrogated the Ecclesiastical Law which since the Concordat had made marriage indissoluble in France. On his election to the Senate for his native department of Vaucluse, M. Naquet was able to take charge of his own Bill—and at length by a majority of 130 votes against 114 the right of divorce was once more legally constituted.

The colonial policy of the Government had on various occasions been made the subject of questions in the Chamber, and more

frequently of discussion in the Press. The attitude adopted by M. Ferry, whilst not without its critics, was on the whole approved by those who gave expression to their views. The principal events of the campaign in Tonquin are described elsewhere, and it is unnecessary to refer to the incidental allusions to the campaign which were made in the Senate and the Chambers, and it was not until after the return from Versailles that the Chinese question was seriously taken up.

On August 14 the Chamber of Deputies referred to a Committee the supplies demanded for the Tonquin expedition. The debate lasted two days. M. Ferry announced that the policy pursued by the French Government could not lead to a state of war, only to a state of reprisals. In spite of this fine distinction, the Chamber voted (173 against 50) an order of the day, moved by MM. Sadi-Carnot and Antonin Prouet, and accepted by the Government, to the following effect:—"The Chamber, confident that the Government will procure the execution of the treaty of Tien-Tsin, proceeds to the order of the day."

In the course of this discussion M. Georges Perrin and M. Frédéric Passy, who never miss an opportunity of criticising the colonial policy of the Government, had dwelt on the small value and importance of the conquests announced by M. Jules Ferry. But their attempts to discredit the Government were without effect. On the following day (August 16) the Senate approved supplies to the amount of 38,483,000 francs voted by the Chamber for the purposes of the campaign.

Admiral Courbet was immediately instructed to open hostilities against China. The French squadron advanced towards Foochow, effected an easy entrance of the Roads, drew up in front of the arsenal and opened fire at two o'clock in the evening of August 23. The action lasted six hours, seven Chinese gun-boats were sunk, and a French torpedo blew up a Chinese vessel, and the arsenal of Foochow was annihilated. On August 26 Admiral Courbet attacked and destroyed the Mingan forts at the entrance of the Roads, and two days later those defending the Kimpai passage, taken in rear, were destroyed also.

M. Jules Ferry had hoped that by the bombardment and destruction of the finest arsenal of the Empire, he would oblige the Tsang-li-Yamen to accept his conditions. But he was mistaken. Satisfied that the French did not intend to make an expedition into the interior, the Chinese Government so completely repudiated all thought of submission, that M. Ferry had to substitute a policy of plunder and destruction for one of reprisals. Admiral Courbet was first ordered to seize the coal mines of Formosa, and thence to harass the enemy by all means in his power. The campaign dragged on through the summer; as soon as the Chamber reassembled in October fresh supplies (40 million francs) were demanded. This fresh credit gave rise to very heated debates, several deputies declaring that M. Jules Ferry had tampered with

the reports of the Commission appointed to examine his previous requirements. The Ministry, however, got a majority in the Chamber, although it was evident, from the violence of the attacks and the weakness of the defence, that the majority of the deputies no longer had the same enthusiasm for remote enterprises that threatened to drag themselves out indefinitely.

To the difficulties in China were added, in 1884, other embarrassments caused by the attitude of the Governments of Anam and Cambodia. The Court of Hué, having succeeded in getting the treaty of August 1883 cancelled, resumed possession of the confiscated provinces, and affected to ignore the presence of the French in the Citadel. Colonel Guerrier, *chef d'état-major* to General Millot, was sent to this town in the middle of July and, in concert with the resident Minister, M. Lemaire, forced the Mandarins of Hué to give satisfaction. At Cambodia an insurrection broke out in December, provoked by the stupidity of the Government of Cochinchina, and the intrigues of the Ministers of King Norodon.

In Algeria, there were manifestations of discontent in consequence of the Chamber of Deputies having refused the grant of 50 millions asked for the creation of new agricultural centres. In order to satisfy the Colonial party, the French Government published (April 7) a decree, modifying the Imperial decree of 1866, relating to the exercise of municipal rights. Two years of residence were demanded of a native instead of one; the French obtained three-quarters of the posts of Municipal Councillors instead of one-third; the native Municipal Councillors were not to exceed six in Algiers, and they were not to take part in the election of mayors and deputy-mayors. In Tunis the year 1884 saw the suppression of consular jurisdictions and the substitution of French tribunals. By virtue of the law passed in 1883, the conversion of the Tunis debt had been effected. Accordingly the Budget of 1883 did not show a balance of receipts. The receipts of 1884 were estimated at 14,245,200 francs, a sum that exceeded by nearly eight millions the budget of the preceding year. But this increase had for cause the return to the State of revenues which had been granted before. It proved possible, however, to remit the taxes on corn, barley, oils, &c., and still leave a surplus, which was applied to augmenting the Bey's civil list by 120,000 fr. per annum; in replacing the Arab courts of justice by a civil control; in teaching the French language to young Arabs, and in establishing a supervision of the forests, in police expenses and on public works.

A quarrel having broken out in the autumn between the Government of Fez and M. Ordega, the French Minister at Morocco, it was feared that the affair would lead to a repetition of the policy of Tunis; but satisfaction was given by the Government of Morocco, and the incident had no sequel.

In Senegal, the Khayes and Bafoulabé railway scheme, which had swallowed up enormous sums of money without any results, was definitely given up, the Chamber of Deputies granting supplies

to liquidate the debts of this disastrous enterprise ; to carry on the railway from Saint Louis du Sénégal to Dakar, parallel with the coast of the Atlantic, and to maintain the forts which unite the basin of Senegal with that of the Upper Niger. An ambassador from Timbuctoo came to France *via* Saint Louis and Bordeaux, and France agreed that the Conference of Berlin, met to settle the Congo business, should have power to discuss at the same time the navigation of the Niger.

The progress of Brazza's mission to the Gaboon country and on the Niger was poor enough in 1884. On July 5, the Chamber voted a grant of 780,000 fr., which had been asked for by the explorer and proposed by Government, and in support of another plan of the same forward policy, the Chamber voted 8,000,000 fr. for Madagascar (July 21), by 372 against 83. But there was little to show for this expenditure beyond a fort constructed at Ambodimadorin at the base of Pasandava, and a smart skirmish (December 5), which forced the natives to retire some distance northwards.

In the middle of the autumn, owing to the supineness of the Chamber of Deputies, the Budget introduced on February 20 was never properly discussed or voted. The anticipated receipts for 1885 exceeded by 22,000,000 fr. those of 1884, and amounted to 3,048,500,000 fr. M. Rouvier, President of the Budget Commission, announced in his opening speech that the financial position, though not brilliant, was yet not such as to cause anxiety. He strove to show that the deficit of which the Opposition were complaining did not exist; that, on the contrary, in 1883 the receipts had exceeded the expenditure by 46,000,000 fr., and that if the Budget seemed to show a deficit it was because they had paid off 140,000,000 fr. of six-year bonds. These optimistic statements could not, however, be taken as quite accurate, because if the six-year bonds which made such a good figure in the President's speech were paid off, it was because their term had expired, and to renew them would have charged the coming years at least as heavily as the Treasury bonds issued to cover the deficit of 1884.

The Budget Commission having taken a month to choose their President, showed still greater deliberation in the appointment of their reporter, who was not named until the whole of the normal session was gone. M. Rouvier had become Minister of Commerce in place of M. Hérisson, who seemed to be unequal to the emergencies of the situation, now that serious corn-law and protection questions were imminent. He had, moreover, failed to bring to the Ministry the support of his radical friends, whilst M. Ferry's Ministry could ill afford to throw away the chances of outside support. It was not, therefore, till November that the preparation of the report on the Budget was seriously begun, whilst the debate in the Chamber, commenced at the close of the month, was not brought to a conclusion until a few days before Christmas. It must, nevertheless, be admitted that the Budget of 1885 was

thoroughly considered. Even the *Journal des Débats* acknowledged that the special committees for the budgets of the different departments had shown much zeal, patience, and intelligence. But if the preparatory work of the committees was carefully done, it is certain that the precipitation with which the Chamber voted upon the separate clauses, and the energy with which it threw out all amendments, gave occasion for grave dissatisfaction. The enemies of the Government did not fail to say that the Chamber of Deputies treated its most important duty with an unheard-of want of ceremony, when it relegated the vote on the Budget to a committee; that the country no longer exercised any real control over its affairs, since all serious decisions were taken secretly in committee; and above all that the majority had systematically excluded all members of the Right from the Finance Commission. But secret as had been the labours of this Commission, something transpired none the less. In the course of November, the *National* asserted that M. Jules Ferry had said to its members:—"We do not propose new taxes this year; you know our motive; it is because of the elections. But we shall not be able to escape the necessity of new taxes in 1886." In spite of the confused explanations of the Minister, all the world was convinced that these words had been spoken, and that they represented the real state of affairs.

It having been impossible for the Chamber of Deputies to close the discussion of the Budget earlier (December 20), it was not sent up to the Senate till two days later, and it was therefore obvious that no report from that body could be drawn up, printed and adopted before the close of the year. Moreover, the Senate was determined not to show the same yielding disposition as in the year before. Since the Chamber had taken no account of the protests made twelve months previously, the Senate resolved to stand by its right of effective control over the Budget. M. Calmon (President of the Finance Committee) drew attention to the lateness of the date, and proposed to exonerate the Senate from responsibility by a suggestion to vote provisionally a month's supplies, if demanded.

The Senate having thereupon refused to approve *en bloc* and without discussion the reductions of expenses and the new liabilities passed by the Chamber of Deputies, the Ministry suggested as a compromise that Parliament should pass the Budget of receipts for the whole year, and vote in the first quarter of the new year the amount of 1,032,916,760 fr. on account of the estimated expenses. This expedient, although attacked in the Senate by M. Léon Say as establishing a dangerous precedent, was adopted by a majority of the Senate at the last sitting.

Parliament thus separated (December 29) without having voted the Budget. Since 1877, when the necessity of bringing the Government of May 16 to terms had forced the Chambers only to vote a provisional monthly Budget, this was the first time that the

Budget remained in suspense in time of peace. The credit of the majority was severely impaired by the circumstance. Moreover, in the second half of the year 1884, and during the autumn session, the confidence of the majority in the vigour of the Government had been failing. The Ministry had been more strongly coloured with Gambettaism by the accession of M. Rouvier, and by their concessions to M. Waldeck-Rousseau, and to the group of the Republican Union. On the other hand, M. Jules Ferry was alienating the Liberal Republicans. The senatorial elections were drawing near, and about thirty deputies, belonging to the ministerial majority, were preparing with everything in their favour to come forward as candidates for the Upper Chamber. Their translation would, of course, considerably weaken the ranks of the ministerial party in the Lower Chamber.

Going back upon the History of France, we find the political situation of the end of 1884 matched by a crisis that has been nearly forgotten. In 1827, a minister of Charles X. had a strong majority in the Chamber of Deputies, but was held in check by the Chamber of Peers. It occurred to him to introduce a strong contingent of his friends into the Luxembourg. But by this act he brought on new elections, and the new elections returned a Chamber which first threw him out, and two years later made the revolution of 1830. This minister was M. de Villèle, and he was considered the cleverest defender of the Restoration; and it was by his cleverness that he brought about the ruin of his party.

II. ITALY.

At the beginning of 1884 Italy was less enthusiastic about the triple alliance than she had been before. Her attitude towards the three Emperors had seemed, after the reverberating debates of 1883, to be not altogether one of equality and reciprocity. Moreover, a considerable number of the friends of the Ministry were disposed to support an attempt at a new combination. The year 1884 was marked by efforts to make friends with the Western Powers, and to inaugurate a policy of conciliation towards France and of cordial understanding with England.

At the beginning of January Signor Mancini, head of the Foreign Office, announced to the French Ambassador, M. Decrais, that Italy adhered in principle to the suppression of the Tunis capitulations, and that the Italian Government was disposed to bring into Parliament a Bill to this effect, and a protocol was signed (January 25) stating the particulars of the agreement between France and Italy.

But the interest first awakened by this Bill was soon diverted to other matters: the struggle between the Papal party and the Liberal party in Rome, and the struggle of the "Pentarchy" in Parliament against the

The Liberal party had ventured to stir up a great manifestation at Rome on the occasion of the removal of the ashes of Victor Emmanuel to the Pantheon. On January 7, the anniversary of the death of the King, a first band of national pilgrims defiled through the streets of Rome, displaying the national banner and other flags carrying patriotic devices in honour of Mazzini, Garibaldi, &c.; the *irredentist* symbols had been proscribed. The success of this first display of the Liberal forces encouraged the committees in Rome and other large towns to organise two more in the course of January. The third was the most remarkable because of the great number of peasants in picturesque costumes who were brought from the depths of Calabria to the show. The Catholics abstained from disturbing the procession, and so there was no repetition of the scandal that marked the removal of the body of Pius IX. This the Liberals regarded as a victory.

At the end of January the Catholics suffered a more serious blow. The Court of Cassation passed a decree by which the property of the Propaganda in Rome and Italy was made subject as well as all other church property to the law of disestablishment. The practical result of this decree, which settled a question that had been long in litigation, was to levy a tax of 30 per cent. on the revenues of the propagandist congregations. The Pope complained bitterly of this measure, and his irritation showed itself in the inflexibility with which he refused to receive the Prince and Princess of Bavaria, who had paid a visit to the Quirinal before presenting themselves at the Vatican. The fact that the Princess is the daughter of the Empress of Austria and a very zealous Catholic, gave special significance to this refusal. A few days later, the Pope having to appoint a Cardinal at Rome, gave the seat to Cardinal Parocchi, to whom the Italian Government had formerly refused to grant an *exequatur* as Archbishop of Bologna.

Meanwhile the chiefs of the Pentarchy were attacking the Ministry *à propos* of the Higher Education Act. Signor Bacelli was vigorously supported by the President of the Council (Signor Depretis). But the Right was evidently unwilling to pass the Bill, and the Minister of Public Instruction had many personal enemies among the friends of Signor Minghetti. But the President of the Council having declared that he and his colleague stood or fell together, the Right voted for the Bill, and bore with the Minister rather than overthrow the Cabinet. The Bacelli Bill was accordingly passed by the Chamber of Deputies on February 28 by 143 votes against 139. It was at best a disastrous victory; Signor Depretis had only obtained it by using all his influence, and sparing himself so little that he fell ill; and moreover, it was more than probable that the Senate would not pass the measure on the recommendation of so small a majority. Signor Bacelli sent in his resignation, and the whole Cabinet was disorganised.

Signor Depretis resigned also. The President of the Chamber, Signor Farini, renounced the task of conducting the debates of an Assembly where his authority was set at nought. Signor Grimaldi made the Chamber pass an order of the day by which the majority expressed its confidence in the President, and refused to accept his resignation. But Signor Farini persisted in his determination to retire.

The death of Signor Sella interrupted the political battle and gave the Chamber the opportunity of making an important manifestation. On March 15 it was decided that the sittings should be suspended during three days, that the tribune should be veiled for a fortnight, and that a monument should be erected at the expense of the State. These extraordinary honours expressed the gratitude of Italy towards the statesman who had contributed more than any other to push the Italian battalions upon the Eternal City (1870), and whose activity and courage in braving unpopularity had saved the financial credit of the country. By this death Signor Depretis was delivered from his most formidable opponent and the only man who could have built up again the independence of the Right.

The King again entrusted (March 23) to the deputy for Stradella the task of forming a Government, and a week later the new Cabinet met the Chamber. It consisted of the same men who composed the Cabinet of May 29, 1881, with two exceptions. Signor Bacelli was replaced at the Office of Public Instruction by Signor Coppino, and Signor Grimaldi was Minister of Agriculture. Signor Depretis remained at the Home Office, Signor Mancini at the Foreign Office, Signor Genala at the Office of Public Works, and Signor Magliani was Minister of Finance.

Signor Depretis was confined to his sick room for several weeks, and his illness delayed, until the autumn session, the principal business of the year—the contract by which the railway system of the country was to be handed over to the State. While the King was solemnly opening the Turin Exhibition on April 26, M. Magliani was painfully dragging from the Chamber a vote upon the Budget. In Italy, as in France, the Budget (*bilancio*) has to be first voted by the Chamber, and then approved by the Senate. In Italy, as in France, the Lower Chamber has shown of late years a more and more obstinate disposition to let the debate on the Budget stand over till the last days of the session, giving precedence to personal questions and exciting interpellations; and for several years the examination of the Budget had been put off until the special autumn session. As this session began at the end of November and closed at Christmas, very little time was left, and in 1881 the plan was adopted of only voting half the Budget, and making the financial year begin on July 1, by which means it was hoped that time would be secured for a thorough discussion later on. But the new arrangement did not succeed any better than the old one. The discussion of the Budget, beginning in February,

dragged on to June 26. The Senate, in order to avoid the humiliation of voting a provisional monthly Budget (which, moreover, was absolutely prohibited by the law of liability), was obliged to study, report upon and discuss the whole Budget in three days. This vexatious delay provoked from Signor Bonghi a pamphlet entitled "Decadence of the Parliamentary System in Italy," which made considerable noise. According to the author of this paper, which appeared first in the *Nuova Antologia*, the parliamentary system in Italy has arrived at complete bankruptcy; the parties in the Chamber have no homogeneity, no discipline, and are altogether less compact than in 1876. It might have been thought that the habit of government would by degrees have imparted some measure of moderation to the different sections of the Chamber, especially as by singular good fortune power has belonged in turn to the Right, to the Left, to the Centre, and to those coalitions of the moderate Left and the Right, known under the name of the Transformation (*trasformazione*). But far from gaining the self-control that is necessary to the conduct of constitutional government, the Italian deputies delight more and more in interminable quarrels and childish bickerings, and carry the most unworthy temper into the most important matters.

These manœuvres of the Liberals were turned to advantage at Rome by the Papal party, who entered boldly into the contest of the municipal elections of the month of June. For the first time since 1870, the chiefs of the Roman aristocracy, whose sovereign is at the Vatican and not at the Quirinal, made trial of their strength, and taking for their motto *Rome for the Romans*, drew up a list of candidates for the Council of Rome, under the title of the Roman Union. They included a few Liberal names in their list, notably that of Councillor Bartocini, who, though a progressist and an intimate friend of Mazzini, was of Roman origin. All who were not Romans were rigorously excluded. The principal grievance alleged against the Liberals was the Budget; they were accused of being too liberal with the public funds—those of the State as well as of the Communes. Naples and Genoa, the most populous and the first commercial town of Italy, were lost to the Liberals and gained by the Catholics.

Apart from the Budget, the most interesting debate in the course of June was the Camporeale interpellation on the subject of the disagreement between France and Morocco. Signor Mancini refused to yield to the representations of the Left, who urged him to support the Moors. It was remarked that since Italy had not gone to war with France about the Tunis affair, there was much less occasion to do so about Morocco; that, moreover, Spain and England were both more interested than Italy in preventing France from establishing herself on the south coast of the Straits of Gibraltar. A vote of confidence was asked and obtained by the Government.

While Turin was inviting strangers to visit its Exhibition, the

cholera broke out in Italy, and after having ravaged several towns of Piedmont and Tuscany, declared itself with fearful intensity at Naples. It was recognised that in order to put this great city—of which the greater part of the poor live in veritable underground cellars—into a satisfactory sanitary condition, 100,000,000 lire would be required, of which one half should be furnished by the State, and the other by the town and the province.

The recess was agitated by the epidemic and the Tessin question. Signor Grecchi, Italian consul at Lugano, published a pamphlet, in which he demanded the annexation to Italy of the Swiss canton of Tessin on the pretext that the towns of Lugano and Brizzago manufacture an enormous quantity of cigars which are smuggled into Italy, as also sugar, coffee, and petroleum. The Government of Berne, not unreasonably indignant at an attack emanating from a consul, obtained the disgrace of the too zealous functionary. But Signor Mancini stipulated that a Conference should take place between the delegates of the Federal Council and the representatives of the Italian Government to settle the question of the Helveto-Italian frontier south of the Alps, and facilitate the repression of smuggling. This Conference did not have much more result than the more imposing Egyptian Conference in London.

As a consequence of the Egyptian Conference, it has been seen that an identical protest had been signed by the Powers against the suspension of *amortissements* in Egypt. The Italian Government refused at first to join in the action of the other Powers, and the *Diritto* explained the attitude of Signor Mancini thus: "The question of the suspension of *amortissements* is at once one of law and of expediency. From the first point of view, the suspension is a violation of the law of liquidation; from the second point of view, it must be acknowledged that the measure is not a great evil. This is a perfectly reasonable distinction, and it is on this ground that Italy separates herself from the other Powers."

None the less, on October 18, Signor Mancini protested in his turn, but in very moderate terms; and as if to show how little importance he attached to the question, he instructed Signor Bavarelli, Italian member of the *Caisse de la Dette*, to discontinue the action he had begun against the Egyptian Government. The interview between the three Emperors at Skierniewice had been regarded by almost all parties in Italy as a defiance of the triple alliance on the question of the Government of Rome, and the unexpected and startling *rapprochement* between M. Jules Ferry's Government and that of Germany compelled Italy to enter into closer relations with England. Active negotiations were begun with the English Government, and the result was that Signor Mancini decided to occupy Assab, first with an insignificant detachment of Italian troops, and later with a considerable force, wh

out in the first days of

1885, and of which the destination was not to be made known at once.

It was not the Minister of War, Signor Tenero, who had to organise this expedition—the first Italy had sent out of the Peninsula since the Crimean War. Signor Tenero had sent in his resignation on the ground of ill-health, and had been replaced (October 24) by General Ricotti. This officer had been in the Minghetti Ministry, and had only left office in 1876 when the Left came into power. A good administrator, author of the new organisation of the Italian Army, and famous for the creation of the battalion of *Chasseurs des Alpes*, who are reckoned the best troops in Europe for mountain service, Signor Ricotti had been, since the death of Signor Sella, the true leader of the Right. His admission to the Ministry completed the work of Transformation, and cemented the alliance of Signor Depretis with his former adversaries. The Government was therefore able to look forward with confidence to the debates of the extra session of Parliament.

In spite of a protest from Signor Cairoli, precedence was given to the discussion of the Government Bill respecting the railways, which was conducted with remarkable talent by the Minister of Public Works, Signor Genala. In vain Signor Luzzati, one of the leaders of the school of State Socialists, proposed a counter project, by which he asked for State control of all the railways. Though he was supported by all the members of the Left, he only obtained 89 votes, and the Government got an order of the day, implying at once confidence in the majority and adoption of the principle of conventions. The majority was 80 on the first paragraph, and 45 on the second. The clauses of the Bill remained to be discussed, but this could not be done until after the close of the year.

CHAPTER II.

GERMANY.

THE text of Prince Bismarck's Bill for a new scheme of insurance for working men, one of the chief measures of the German Parliamentary session, was published on January 7. According to this Bill all the employers of labour in the German Empire are to be compelled to form insurance companies, with corporate rights, for each department of trade or manufactures, and to defray the whole of the premiums necessary for insuring the lives of their workmen, and the payment of fixed sums to them in cases of injury sustained in the performance of their work. The payments at death, or in cases of injury, are to be determined in proportion to the wages earned in each case; and although the employers are to be primarily responsible for such payments, the State is to provide the necessary funds in the event of the employer being in any

case unable to meet his liabilities. All the companies are to be under the supervision and authority of an Imperial Assurance Board, the members of which are to be permanent, and to be appointed in equal proportions by the Emperor, the Federal Council, and the companies and working men's committees. Special attention was drawn to this Bill in the speech from the throne at the opening of the German Parliament on March 6. It was observed in this speech that "the fulfilment of this duty towards the labouring population is intended to rouse the latter to a consciousness of the blessings attending the peaceful development of the unified Fatherland; to withdraw the ground from those revolutionary elements that worked for the overthrow of Divine and human institutions; and to pave the way for abolishing the exceptional measures enacted to combat those anarchic agencies." The debate on the Bill was opened March 13, and after some discussion, in which Prince Bismarck took part, it was unanimously referred to a select committee. The committee reported in favour of the Bill, and it was passed June 27, and approved on July 6 by the Federal Council, whose sanction was necessary before it could become law for the whole of Germany. The Bill gave rise to a good deal of discussion, especially with regard to the proposal that, in the event of the employers failing to provide the necessary funds for the payment of any policy under the new scheme, the deficiency should be supplied by the State. On this point a very obstinate opposition was raised by the newly formed party of the "German Liberals" (*Deutschfreisinnige*) under Herr Eugen Richter; but the Government, having consented to the establishment by the employers of a reserve fund for the purpose of meeting such contingencies, obtained a majority, comprising the National Liberals and the Centre party, in favour of the Bill. The debates on this measure showed that a new distribution of parties had taken place in the Reichstag. The National Liberals, who had become utterly disorganised by the withdrawal of their leader, Herr von Bennigsen, from public affairs last year, now resumed their position as one of the great parties in the State, and acted with a unity and vigour which showed that they were in no way discouraged by their late reverses. On May 18 a convention of the party was held at Berlin, at which upwards of five hundred delegates from all parts of the Empire were present. Herr Hobrecht, an ex-Minister, presided, and Herr von Bennigsen, Herr Miquel, and other distinguished members of the party, took an active part in the proceedings. A declaration was unanimously adopted, asserting the loyalty of the National Liberals to the Emperor and their resolve to maintain unimpaired the constitutional rights of the representatives of the people, and pledging them to support the Accidents Insurance Bill and the Anti-Socialist Bill. The "Secessionists," on the other hand, who had separated themselves from the National Liberals, under Herr Rickert, in 1880, united with the Progressists under Herr Eugen

Richter, and the combined party styled itself the "Deutsch-freisinnige" or "German Liberals." Its political programme, as issued in the beginning of March, embraced the following points:— development of a real constitutional *régime*; creation of a responsible Ministry; maintenance of annual budgets, of freedom of speech, of universal suffrage and the ballot, of religious freedom, and of freedom of the press and of public meeting; the abolition of monopolies; the payment of members of the Reichsrath; the reduction of the period of military service to two years; and opposition to all proposed contributions by the State to funds necessary for the improvement of the condition of the working classes. Thus the National Liberal party adhered to its old policy of promoting the unity and progress of the Empire by maintaining a conciliatory attitude towards Prince Bismarck, notwithstanding the anti-Liberal tendencies of that statesman; while the New Liberal party became, like the Progressists from whom it sprang, a *parti de combat*.

This new attitude of the National Liberal party was also of great service to the Government in the debate on the continuance of the law against Socialism. The reasons alleged by the Government for prolonging this law for another two years (*i.e.* until September 1886) were the continuance of the Socialist movement and its danger, as shown by recent criminal attacks on life and property in Germany and other civilised States; the good effects produced by the law; and the fact that the fears expressed when it was originally introduced, that the powers given by it might be abused, had proved unfounded. The Bill was introduced in the Reichstag on March 20. Prince Bismarck, in a long speech defending the measure, assumed a friendly tone towards the Centre party, but violently attacked the New Liberals, and the result of the debate was that the Bill was referred to a committee. On May 1 the committee reported against the Bill, ten of its members having voted for and ten against it; but on May 10, after two days' debate, the Reichstag accepted the Bill by a majority of 189 to 157. The majority was composed of all the Conservatives and National Liberals, and a portion of the Ultramontanes and New Liberals, whose want of union secured to the Government an unexpected victory. The result was mainly attributable to two speeches made by the Chancellor on the last day of the debate, in which he threatened a dissolution if the Bill were not passed, and again made an attack on the New Liberal party, as to which he declared his conviction that "it has no future," and asserted that he would "fight against it to his last breath," such being his duty to his country and his Emperor. At the same time he admitted unconditionally the right of a man to work; this, however, he said, is not Socialism, but the Prussian law, which says that if a citizen has not the means of obtaining a maintenance, he should be supplied with work corresponding to his strength and aptitude. "The State is bound to give work to

an able-bodied man who cannot get work by himself." He ended with a compliment to the National Liberals, saying that he belonged to no party himself, but retained his old feeling of esteem and sympathy "for such of the members of the party as had not gone over to the New Liberals."

Another Bill introduced by the Government to combat the dangers of the Socialistic agitation was the "Explosives Bill," which was passed by the Reichstag on May 15. It provides that the manufacture, sale, and possession of explosives, as well as their importation from abroad, shall only be permitted if authorised by the police in each case, and that the following offences shall be punishable by penal servitude:—(1) Wilfully endangering by means of explosives life, person, or property, or ordering explosives with such intent, or under circumstances affording no proof of its having been intended that they should be employed for legal purposes. (2) Inciting to the commission of the above crimes by delivering speeches before popular assemblages, by placarding notices, or by publishing pamphlets. It is further enacted by this measure that when the crimes above mentioned have fatal consequences, the perpetrators of them, if it should appear that they could have foreseen such a result, shall be punished with death. One of the most atrocious of the crimes connected with the Socialistic agitation was the attempt on the life of the Emperor at the unveiling of the Niederwald monument, in September, 1883, the authors of which were tried at Leipzig in December of the present year. The leader of the conspiracy was a compositor named Reinsdorf, who defended himself with great skill, and made an eloquent speech, plentifully interlarded with classical allusions, in favour of the confiscation of private property and the abolition of central government. Reinsdorf's accomplices were Küchler, another compositor, and Rupsch, a journeyman saddler, and the latter confessed, while in prison, that he had, at Reinsdorf's instigation, placed a stone bottle containing dynamite in a drain running across the road by which the Emperor was to pass, but that he did not light the match, as he had intended from the first to frustrate the plan. This story, however, was not believed by the judges, who sentenced Reinsdorf and his principal accomplices to death.

Constitutional questions occupied a prominent place in German politics this year. At the sitting of the Federal Council on April 5, a resolution was unanimously passed at the instance of the Prussian representative, declaring that the various German Governments, finding it necessary to remove all doubts on the subject, have resolved to maintain faithfully the treaties upon which the Imperial institutions providing for the maintenance of the law within the Federal territory according to the Imperial Constitution are based, and to declare that the establishment of a responsible Ministry in the German Empire could only be carried out

at the expense of those treaty rights which the Federal Governments now exercise, as the most essential powers of government now possessed by the various Federal States would be absorbed by such an Imperial Ministry, whose action would be at the mercy of every majority in the Reichstag. The Bavarian Plenipotentiary, in supporting this resolution, said that the Bavarian Government was ready actively to co-operate in the national development on a Federal basis, but would always energetically oppose any further development of the Empire in the direction of centralisation; and that it was therefore strongly opposed to the establishment of a responsible Imperial Ministry. This resolution was followed by a *communiqué* in the official *Reichsanzeiger*, referring to Article 45 of the Prussian Constitution, which provides that the executive power shall belong to the King alone, and stating that as the Lower House had transgressed this maxim of the Constitution by passing a resolution requesting the Government to proceed against those officials who had abused their privileges at the elections, the King had drawn the attention of the Ministry to the subject, and had expressed the hope that they would under all similar circumstances maintain the article referred to, and observe the limits therein prescribed to the Legislature, and the executive respectively. On June 19 were announced the appointments to the new Prussian States Council. The Crown Prince was appointed President, Prince Bismarck Vice-President, and Herr von Nöller State Secretary; and of the seventy-one members twelve were selected from landed proprietors, six from merchants and manufacturers, four from the clergy, and four from communal officials. The Council was opened October 23, and on this occasion the Crown Prince announced that the work of the Council would be devoted chiefly to matters of legislation, and that it was the intention of the King, whenever the importance of the subject might render it advisable, to request the opinion of the Council upon Bills to be submitted to the Prussian Diet, upon drafts of Imperial decrees, and upon Bills to be introduced by Prussia in the Federal Council relating to matters of Imperial legislation. The death, on October 18, of Duke William of Brunswick, raised a further constitutional question, which was temporarily disposed of by the establishment of a regency, and the taking over of the military administration by Prussia, notwithstanding the protests of the Duke of Cumberland, the pretender to the throne of the duchy.

The elections for the sixth German Parliament took place on October 28, and resulted in a disastrous defeat for the New Liberal (*Deutschfreisinnige*) party. The following are the numbers of the various parties in the new Reichstag, and its predecessor respectively:—

	Old Parliament	New Parliament
German Conservatives	50	76
Imperialists	24	28
National Liberals	45	53
New Liberals	104	63
Other Liberals	13	4
Socialists	10	24
Democrats	9	7
Centre	109	109
Poles	16	16
Protest Party (Alsace-Lorraine)	15	15
Danes	2	2

Next to the defeat of the New Liberals, the most prominent feature of these elections was the rapid growth of the Socialist party, whose numbers in the House had more than doubled. In Hamburg alone, notwithstanding the proclamation of the "minor state of siege," the number of Socialist voters had increased from 23,106 to 37,477.

The first sittings of the new Reichstag were marked by a series of defeats for Prince Bismarck. On November 26, the annual motion for the payment of the members of the Reichstag was brought in by Baron Stauffenberg, and though Prince Bismarck spoke four times against the motion, it was carried by 180 to 99, the Conservatives and most of the National Liberals voting with the Government. On December 4, Herr Windthorst, the leader of the Centre, proposed a Bill for the repeal of the law empowering the Government to expel priests who had been guilty of illegal conduct. Prince Bismarck characterised this Bill as an insult to the Federal Council, which had so recently rejected it, and affirmed that the law which it was proposed to repeal was still necessary in the Polish provinces of the Empire, as anti-German intrigues were constantly being carried on by the clergy there. He added that, much as he desired a *modus vivendi* with the Centre, he could not make them any concessions without receiving any. "The Government expects peace, but does not ask it." In a second speech on the subject, the Chancellor pointed out that this was not a question of the freedom of the Church or freedom of public worship, but of preventing the clergy from carrying on political agitation; and remarked that the present occasion afforded an apt illustration of the evils of responsible government, as the majority, which would probably decide in favour of the Bill, was composed of Conservatives, members of the Centre, New Liberals, and Social Democrats; and if this majority had to reconstruct a Government, "the result would be a Ministry like that which was formed in England under Mr. Gladstone." These speeches were even less successful than those he delivered on the question of the payment of members, for the Bill passed the first and second reading by a majority of 217 to 93. But the Prince's third defeat, which took place on December 15, showed that there was a personal animus against him in the House, and caused a strong reaction of public opinion in his favour. The question

under discussion was the salary of 20,000 marks proposed for a second Director at the Foreign Office. Although the Chancellor represented that his office was so undermanned that several of the *employés* had broken down under the pressure of work, and that the vote was absolutely necessary in order that the foreign policy of Germany should be properly carried on, the vote was rejected by 141 to 119. This decision produced an outburst of public indignation, which was expressed in numerous addresses to the Chancellor and articles in the newspapers; and the result certainly seemed to show that the Chancellor was right in declaring that the German Parliament does not truly represent the feeling of the German nation.

In foreign affairs Prince Bismarck, though high-handed and audacious as ever, this year obtained even more than his usual success. The first incident abroad in which he was concerned was the passing of a resolution by the House of Representatives of the United States expressing condolence with the German Reichstag on the death of his old adversary Dr. Lasker, late leader of the National Liberal party. This resolution having been forwarded to Prince Bismarck through the German ambassador, the Prince returned it with an expression of regret at his inability to transmit it to the Reichstag; and, as was to be expected, the political friends of the late Dr. Lasker made a violent demonstration in the Reichstag on the subject. Herr Rickert rose to express his thanks to the American House of Representatives, but was stopped by the President, and after a heated discussion the House adjourned (March 8). A week after, the Chancellor himself came to the Reichstag to vindicate his conduct. After declaring that since the time of Frederick the Great the relations between Germany and the United States had always been most friendly, he said that he would not have hesitated to forward the resolution to the Reichstag if it had not expressed the conviction that the labours of the deceased had been extraordinarily useful to Germany. But Dr. Lasker's labours consisted in opposing his (the Chancellor's) policy and that of the Emperor, and "the Chancellor could be hardly expected to harness himself to the triumphal car of the Opposition, and to forward to the Reichstag, in the name of the Emperor, furnished with his *visa*, a document which contains a condemnation of the Imperial policy and his own." Prince Bismarck added that he was certain that the object of the American House of Representatives was merely to express their cordial good-will to Germany, and the matter then dropped.

The next subject connected with foreign affairs in which the Chancellor personally interfered was the trial at Leipzig of the famous Polish novelist Kraszewski for high treason in betraying to the French Government military secrets as to the Russian, German, and Austrian armies. While the trial was going on, a letter was read in court from Prince Bismarck to the Minister for War, in which the Prince stated that since 1864 there had existed

in Paris a Polish Military Society consisting of thirty members ; that this society collects statistics as to the various European armies ; that it maintains relations with Polish officers in the service of Russia, Germany, and Austria ; and that it propagates among them the idea of the re-establishment of the Kingdom of Poland. He further stated that the society had taken an active part in the great European wars from 1866 to 1878, and that Kraszewski was one of its agents. This letter produced a great sensation both in Germany and in France, and doubtless contributed to Kraszewski's conviction. He was sentenced to five years' imprisonment in a fortress (May 17).

The rapid development of the colonisation movement in Germany this year afforded Prince Bismarck ample opportunities of exercising his diplomatic skill and his remarkable power of directing public opinion in his country on questions of national policy. His failure to induce the German Parliament to accept his schemes for counteracting Socialist agitation by assisting the poorer classes at the expense of the State led him to seek another means of achieving this object by creating German colonies, and thereby at the same time providing new markets for the products of German industry and opening a vent for the superfluous energy which is now often employed in agitation. In a series of speeches made in the Reichstag on the subject in the month of June the Chancellor clearly defined his colonial policy. He was opposed, he said, to what he called the French system of colonisation, viz., first purchasing land and then sending out colonists and garrisons to protect them. Colonies cannot be created artificially ; but, on the other hand, it was natural that Germany should grant care and protection to those colonies which had been established abroad by German enterprise and energy, and he was quite certain that it was the duty of the German State at all hazards to provide them with such protection. As the first Chancellor of the newly-created German Empire, he was not disposed to say that Germany and the German fleet were not strong enough to protect such colonies in case of differences with other nations. He would certainly not make such "a declaration of bankruptcy" on the part of the German nation ; and, on the other hand, he would take care that no encroachment should be made on the justly-acquired rights of any other State. The responsibility for the material development of colonies would, as hitherto, remain in the hands of the colonists, and the State would only interfere in this respect so far as to grant charters similar to that granted by England to the North Borneo Company. The colonies would be left to govern themselves, but the Government at Berlin would send them consuls or residents, and all disputes on internal questions of trade, &c., would be decided by the naval and commercial courts of Bremen, Hamburg, or some other German port. There was no desire to extend the dominions of the Empire, but only to develop commercial enterprise and protect German subjects against the

attacks of neighbours or the opposition of other European States; and there was no intention of keeping garrisons in the German colonies. The speeches above referred to were made during a debate on a Bill for granting State subventions to ocean steamers. The further consideration of this Bill was postponed, but Prince Bismarck's declaration of colonial policy assumed a practical importance through his action in the Congo and Angra Pequena questions. The Conference on the Congo question originated in a proposal to conclude a treaty between England and Portugal for the purpose of settling the relations between those States on the Congo. Prince Bismarck objected to the proposed treaty on the ground that the condition of European settlements on the Congo and at other places on the western coast of Africa should be made a matter of international arrangement, and that Germany was specially interested in this question in consequence of her having extended her protection over the German colonies in the Cameroons, Bimbia, Bagida, and Little-Povo. He then entered into negotiations with France on the subject of inviting the powers to a Conference on the question; the invitations were issued and accepted, and the Conference, which had not terminated its deliberations at the end of the year, met at Berlin on November 15. As regards the Angra Pequena question, the negotiations between England and Germany on this subject were described in a "White Book" issued in December by the Foreign Office at Berlin. The question was first raised in February, 1883, when Count Herbert Bismarck called at the Colonial Office in London on the subject. He stated that a Bremen merchant (Herr Lüderitz) was about to establish a factory on the African coast between the Orange River and the Little Fish River, and had asked protection of the German Government in case of need, and that the latter desired to know whether Her Majesty's Government exercised any authority in that locality. If so, the German Government would be glad if England would extend her protection to this German factory; if not, "they would do their best to extend to it the same measure of protection which they give to their subjects in remote parts of the world, but without having the least design to establish any footing in South Africa." The reply of the British Government was "that the Government of Cape Colony have certain establishments along the coast, but, without more precise information as to the spot where the German factory will be established, it is not possible to form any opinion as to whether the British authorities would have it in their power to give it any protection in case of need;" but that when the required information is furnished it will be forwarded to the Government of the Cape Colony for report. In September, 1883, no further communication having been received from England, the German Embassy again applied to the British Government on the subject, asking whether England "claims the suzerainty of the Bay of Angra Pequena." To this Lord Granville replied on November 21, stating that "although

Her Majesty's Government have not proclaimed the Queen's sovereignty along the whole country, but only at certain points, such as Walfisch Bay and the Angra Pequena Islands, they consider that any claim to sovereignty or jurisdiction by a foreign power between the southern point of Portuguese jurisdiction at latitude 18 and the frontier of the Cape Colony would infringe their legitimate rights," and promising a further communication on the subject as soon as a report was received from a British naval officer who had lately visited Angra Pequena. On December 31, 1883, the German Embassy asked Lord Granville upon what title England can claim sovereignty over the territory, "hitherto considered independent," between Orange River and the 18th degree of south latitude, and "what institutions England there possesses which would secure such legal protection for German subjects in their commercial enterprises and justly-won acquisitions, as would relieve the Empire from the duty of providing itself directly, for its subjects in that territory, the protection of which they may stand in need." To this no reply was received; and on April 24, 1884, the German Government informed the British Foreign Office that, having been informed that the British authorities of the Cape Colony had raised a doubt as to whether the firm of Lüderitz at Angra Pequena were entitled to German protection, Prince Bismarck had "instructed the German Consul on the spot to say that no doubt exists as to this right." On June 4 the German ambassador further stated to Lord Granville that having been informed that the authorities of Cape Colony had reported to Her Majesty's Government that they were ready to incorporate the coast district as far as Walfisch Bay, including Angra Pequena, Prince Bismarck wished Lord Granville to be told "confidentially that the German Government could not recognise such a mode of taking possession of these territories, and could not acknowledge the right of doing so." On June 14 Count Herbert Bismarck called on Lord Granville. He spoke of the importance attached by the German Chancellor to the question of Angra Pequena, complained of "the long delay that had occurred in answering questions to which replies might, to all appearance, have been given in three days," and observed that "in this case not only was the delay in answering objectionable in itself, but it appeared that Lord Derby had availed himself of it to press the Government of the Cape Colony to take steps with a view to anticipate any action on the part of the German Government." He added that as Angra Pequena "had been described in despatches presented to Parliament by Her Majesty's Government in 1880 as being outside the limits of the British Colony," and as German protection could not be refused to German subjects, Prince Bismarck had thought it right to announce, both at the Cape and to Her Majesty's Government, that Angra Pequena "had an undoubted right to the protection of the German Empire." Finally, on July 14, Lord Granville announced to the German

Government that "after careful consideration of the communications which have passed, and of all the circumstances of the case, Her Majesty's Government have come to the conclusion that in view of the definitions which have been publicly given by them of the limits of Cape Colony, the claim of the German Government to afford protection to German subjects who have established themselves at Angra Pequena under native chiefs cannot be contested," and that "Her Majesty's Government are therefore prepared to recognise the right of the German Government to protect German subjects at Angra Pequena as soon as proper arrangements can be agreed upon between the two Governments for giving security against the formation of any penal settlement upon any part of the coast in question, and for making provision for the recognition of acquired rights, and the protection of the interests of British subjects who may hold concessions or carry on trade in those parts." The consequence of this communication was that on August 7 the "Lüderitz Territory," from the Orange River to the 26th degree of south latitude, was placed under the protection of Germany by one of the Emperor's ships; and on September 19 Lord Granville stated to the German Government that "Her Majesty's Government will welcome Germany as a neighbour in those parts of the coast which are not already within the limits of the Cape Colony and not actually in British possession." The procrastinating policy pursued by the English Government in this matter, however, caused a good deal of ill-feeling in Germany, and the mingled firmness and conciliation exhibited by Prince Bismarck in conducting the negotiations was universally applauded. As if at the same time to secure allies for his countrymen at the Cape, negotiations were opened for a convention between Germany and the Transvaal, and the delegates of the latter country were received at a special audience by the German Emperor on June 8. These incidents, coupled with the brusque refusal of Lord Granville to permit Count Münster to raise the question of the reform of the Egyptian sanitary system at the Conference on Egyptian finance, considerably strained the relations between England and Germany; but there does not appear to be any reasonable ground for the supposition that the coldness between the two nations was attributable to any personal hostility of Prince Bismarck towards Mr. Gladstone.

With France and the other great Continental Powers, on the other hand, the relations of Germany have, in the year 1884, been specially cordial. The insult to the German flag by the populace in front of the Hôtel Continental at the Republican fête on July 14 was deplored by all sensible men in both nations, and the incident was closed by M. Jules Ferry personally expressing his regret to the German ambassador, and promising that the guilty parties should be punished. The state of affairs between France and Germany during the whole of the year was, to use Prince Bismarck's words in a speech delivered at the Reichstag on

June 26, one of "mutual friendship and confidence;" and he added that, "so far as human foresight can extend, there is no possibility, either in the present or for the future, of a war between Germany and France." Such a war could only have been possible by an alliance between France and Russia, although even then it would have been a hazardous enterprise against the combination which had been created by the German Chancellor between Germany, Austria, Italy, and Roumania. But the aspirations of France in Egypt, and her difficulties in China, naturally led her to seek a supporter in Germany, who, while caring little for Egypt, attached the highest importance to being in peaceful relations with France; and Russia was very easily led to resume those bonds of alliance which had been cut asunder by the pique of the late Prince Gortschakoff at having, as he supposed, been duped by his great rival. The pacific mission to Germany of Prince Dolgorouky in the autumn of the preceding year was repeated in February, and at the end of that month another friendly demonstration was made by the Grand Duke Michael, who came to congratulate the Emperor William on the seventieth anniversary of his having received the Russian Order of the Cross of St. George. After the usual meetings of the Emperors of Germany and Austria at Ischl in the month of August, they held a conference (September 15-17) with the Emperor of Russia at Skierniewice, in Poland. The Emperors were accompanied on this occasion by their Foreign Ministers, and a formal alliance was concluded between them, one of the chief features of which was an agreement to maintain the *status quo* in Eastern Europe.

CHAPTER III.

EASTERN EUROPE.

I. AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

THE Austrian Reichsrath resumed its sittings after the Christmas vacation on January 22, and the first subject which came under discussion again revived that strife among the nationalities which, since the establishment of the dualist system in 1867, has been the greatest danger of the Empire. The debate turned on Count Wurmbrand's motion for the maintenance of German as the official language of the western half of the monarchy. The motion was opposed by the Slavonic members on the ground that a question of this kind should be left to the State to decide, and was ultimately rejected by the House, the Ministry having declared that it was in their opinion impolitic as well as unnecessary to raise the question, and that they would abstain both from speaking and from voting on it. The excitement manifested in this barren debate was soon eclipsed by that produced by the issue, on

February 1, of a series of decrees virtually suspending the Constitution. Under these decrees trial by jury in criminal cases was suspended, and the Government was given power to arrest and imprison for eight days without judicial order or warrant; to expel not only suspected persons, but those harbouring them, and to sentence the latter to six months' hard labour or a fine of a thousand florins; to forbid the fabrication, sale, or possession of arms and ammunition by unauthorised persons; to forbid public meetings, to disperse crowds, to issue stringent passport regulations, to search private houses, to seize and examine private letters, to dissolve associations and clubs, close printing and newspaper offices, and prosecute printers and editors. The above decrees, which were issued under a law passed in 1869, enabled the Government to place Vienna under a system of police supervision far more severe than the "little state of siege" at Berlin, and were the consequence of information received by the Government of a Socialist conspiracy which threatened serious danger not only to individuals, but to the State. The Government, armed with the new powers it had thus obtained, at once took steps to break up this conspiracy. The printing office of the Socialist paper *Zukunft* ("The Future") was closed, and its contents confiscated; forty Socialists were expelled from Vienna, and a Socialist named Stellmacher, who had murdered a detective at Floridsdorf on January 24, was arrested and brought to trial, and subsequently executed (June 11). A debate on the new decrees was opened in the Reichsrath on February 14. The German members, as usual, violently attacked the Government, alleging that the suspension of constitutional rights, though proclaimed ostensibly for the purpose of putting down Socialism, affected all classes of the people. To this Count Taaffe's answer was conclusive. "If," he said, "I thought Liberalism dangerous, I should attack it openly, and not from an ambush. The Government will only act against anarchical tendencies. If the decrees are reactionary, the Liberals who passed the law of 1869 must also have been reactionary. The Government desire to protect the people against murder and arson. Socialism must also be combated by other means; and, with a view to improving the condition of the working-men, the House will soon be called upon to discuss a Bill granting them the means of subsistence in cases of accident." This statement decided the victory of the Government, and the decrees were voted by a majority of 177 to 144. There is no doubt that these severe regulations were carried out so as to cause as little inconvenience as possible to the peaceful inhabitants. As soon as all the known "anarchist" leaders, as they were called, were arrested or expelled, the searches in private houses ceased, and the exceptional rules laid down with regard to meetings and clubs were greatly relaxed. The strength of the Vienna police, however, was raised from 2,000 to 2,400 men. Another important arrest was made on February 28. A young metal-worker named Kammerer, who was known to

be intimately connected with the "anarchist" party, having returned to Austria from America, the detectives were set on his track, and captured him after a severe struggle in which two of the police were seriously wounded. A large box containing dynamite, together with a number of compromising letters, was found in his lodgings. The total number of "anarchists" expelled up to the end of February was 238, of whom 215 were foreigners.

At the beginning of April a dispute broke out between the Cisleithanian and Hungarian Governments which produced much angry feeling between the two halves of the Empire. Under the constitution they are secured equal rights as regards trade and marketing by a customs' union, but the Hungarian cattle-breeders had for some time practically enjoyed a monopoly of the meat supply of Vienna, owing to the abundance of their stock, and the regularity with which it was brought to that city. The Viennese complained that this monopoly led to an inordinate rise in the price of meat, and in order to compete with the Hungarians, a company was formed at Vienna, which was granted special privileges by the Government. This, however, gave great dissatisfaction to the Viennese butchers, who sided with the Hungarian cattle-breeders, and, in order to ruin the Viennese Company, transferred their market from Vienna to Pressburg, on the Austro-Hungarian frontier, where the Hungarians brought their cattle. The Government replied by inducing the railway companies to considerably lower their charges for the conveyance of Galician cattle, and by prohibiting any Hungarian cattle from being brought from the Pressburg market to Vienna, unless they were examined by the sanitary authorities at the frontier, and afterwards passed through the Viennese market of St. Marx. This step produced a loud outcry in Hungary, where it was described as a violation of the stipulations of the customs' union. On April 5 the matter was brought before the Hungarian Parliament, and the Premier, M. Tisza, declared that in his opinion the action of the Viennese Ministry was "without justification," and that steps would be taken for fully protecting the interests of Hungary. Fortunately the Constitution provides that in such cases a conference of the Ministers of Hungary and Cisleithania should take place. Such a conference met in May, and the dispute was amicably arranged.

The practice of members of Parliament settling their differences by a duel, which has died out in Germany, still survives among the more excitable Viennese. On May 9 an encounter of this kind took place between Herr von Schönerer and Dr. Reschauer, both members of the German Radical party, the former having accused the latter, who is also editor of the *Deutsche Zeitung*, of having received bribes from the Northern Railway Company for articles published in his paper. The duel resembled the famous one between M. Gambetta and M. de Fortou. The pistols used were smooth-barrelled and without sights, and only one shot was exchanged between the adversaries; neither of them was hurt.

Another curious dispute took place in the House on the occasion of the passing of a Bill for regulating the hours of labour in factories. It so happened that on this occasion the members of the majority were but thinly represented in the House, while an unusually large number of Radicals (who were opposed to the Bill) were present. The division was taken in the usual manner by the supporters of the Bill rising in their places, and the President (Dr. Smolka) then declared that the Bill had passed. This elicited a storm of protests from the Radicals. Dr. Sturm, their leader, accused the President of unconstitutional conduct in declaring that the Bill had passed when it was evident that its supporters were in a minority. The President replied that such was not his impression, and that in any case the decision could not be altered; but he subsequently expressed his regret for the mistake. The Bill which thus became law is one of the greatest importance for Austrian industry, as it provides that workmen in factories shall not be occupied for more than eleven hours out of the twenty-four, and shall have at least one hour's interval for meals. This provision, however desirable from a philanthropic point of view, places Austria at a considerable disadvantage as a competitor with other continental countries, and especially with Hungary, where no such restrictions exist.

In Hungary, the chief question which occupied public attention at the beginning of the year was that of legalising marriages between Christians and Jews. The Bill with this object, which had been twice passed in the Lower House, was brought before the Upper on January 12, and was again rejected by 200 to 191; but on February 6, after five days' turbulent debate, it was decided in the Lower House, by a majority of 171 to 131, that the Bill should be again introduced by the Government. Curiously enough, the opponents of the measure were a combination of Conservatives and extreme Radicals. Some serious riots took place in the last half of May on account of the then approaching general elections. On this occasion a remarkable manifesto was issued by Louis Kossuth, in reply to an address of congratulation on his eightieth birthday. In this document the revolutionist and "irreconcilable" of 1849 admitted that "the present position of Hungary is in accordance with the real wants of the nation," that "all parties now stand on the basis of loyalty to the dynasty," that this loyalty is "unshakeable," and that it "affords an amply sufficient guarantee for the future of the Hungarian State." Under these circumstances he declared himself an opponent of revolutionary ideas in Hungary, and expressed a hope that the Hungarians might be preserved from revolutions in future. He thus abandoned the policy he had preached since 1849, and reverted to that which he professed in 1848, viz., adherence to the law, and loyalty to the sovereign.

The excitement caused by the elections culminated in the month of June, when more riots, in which several persons were killed and wounded, took place in the district of Klausenburg and other

be intir
turned
track, a
police
togethe
lodging
end of

At
Cisleit
angry
consti
marke
had f
suppl
regul
com
price
com
lege
to th
bre
thei
from
mer
low
pro
Pre
sar
th
ou
st
bi
T
A
t
t
c

fourth of the total numbers in the House when it is first constituted under the Bill, or a third at any future period.

The Radical party in Croatia continued to give trouble to the Government throughout the year, and in July its attitude was so menacing that it was found necessary to place Agram, the capital, under martial law. The elections to the Croatian Diet in September only had the effect of increasing the numbers of the Radical or Starcevic party, which, however, still remained in a minority in the Diet. When the House met, the conduct of this party became so outrageous that the Government decided to have recourse to force, as had been done on a previous occasion. On October 24, the court and lobbies of the House were filled with lines of gendarmes drawn up with fixed bayonets, and when M. Starcevic and his followers arrived, they were expelled from the building.

Some interesting revelations as to the plans and movements of the dynamiters (or, as they are called in Austria, anarchists) were made during the year at Vienna. In June the trials of twenty-three "anarchists" took place in that city. The accusation against them rested on the evidence of a man named Podboy, who was convicted in January of high treason, and had turned informer. It appeared from his statements that the "anarchists" were at that time entirely under the command of a Committee in New York. They organised clubs and made collections for various purposes connected with the organisation, including the purchase of arms; and in March 1883 they had had three secret sittings, at which it was decided to assassinate the Emperor by means of bombs during his visit to Gratz in that year. These meetings were presided over by a Michael Kappauf, who read a letter from New York, signed "Justus Schwab," announcing that the bombs were already on the way, and urged those present to throw lots in order to fix upon the persons who were to carry out the decision. The project was foiled, however, by the police, and a number of arrests were made. In July a young man was arrested on suspicion of being connected with the dynamiters, and on him were found a large dynamite bomb, two awls with their points poisoned with prussic acid, and a revolver. He was sentenced to ten years' penal servitude. These incidents, coupled with the frequent cases of incendiarism in the Austrian capital, were alleged by the Government in justification for the proposal it brought before the Reichsrath in December to renew the decrees issued in January for the suspension of trial by jury in Vienna, and to extend them to the surrounding districts.

The leading position maintained in home affairs by Count Taaffe in the western and M. Tisza in the eastern half of the monarchy was equally held in foreign affairs by Count Kalnoky. In the three great representative bodies of Austria-Hungary—the Austrian and Hungarian Parliaments and the Delegations—the Government had an assured majority which reduced the

Opposition almost to impotence. Count Kalnoky, in entering upon the duties of Foreign Minister, had set to himself the task of putting an end to the rivalry with Russia which had been one of the cardinal elements of the policy of his predecessors, and the interview of the three Emperors at Skierniewice attested the success of his policy. Thus, thanks to the efforts of her Foreign Ministers since 1866—Counts Beust and Andrassy, who established the alliance with Germany, Baron Haymerle, who added Italy to the alliance, and Count Kalnoky, who completed it by the adhesion of Russia—Austria was in the year 1884 made more secure against foreign attack than she had been for centuries. The Hungarians, it is true, did not like the Russian alliance; some awkward questions on the subject, which the Minister prudently left unanswered, were put to Count Kalnoky by Professor Szilagyi in the Hungarian delegation, and in the address of the Lower House replying to the speech from the throne at the opening of the Hungarian Parliament a protest was made against it. So strong, indeed, was the feeling in Hungary on the subject that M. Tisza found it necessary to explain in the Hungarian Parliament that there was no written agreement with Russia, but only with Germany, with whom a treaty existed which was equivalent to an offensive and defensive alliance, and that the only object of the meeting at Skierniewice was the consolidation of peace. But the Hungarians have too keen a political instinct not to appreciate the advantage of being on good terms with a neighbour who, without being openly hostile, had so long been undermining the monarchy by intrigue, and they confined themselves to grumbling at what they felt to be wise, though distasteful to their patriotic feeling. The result of the agreement with Russia was soon perceived in a general appeasement of the hitherto turbulent elements in the East. Turkey, Servia, Bulgaria, Greece, and even Montenegro and Roumania, kept up the most cordial relations with the Hofburg; the once famous "Albanian League" was no more heard of, and Bosnia and Herzegovina no longer suffered from the raids of the half-savage tribes across the frontier.

II. RUSSIA.

The Russian Finance Minister, M. Bunge, who in 1883 had urged that a policy of peace was indispensable to save Russia from financial ruin, was able, at the beginning of the year 1884, to point to the accounts of the previous year in confirmation of his views. The estimated ordinary receipts for 1884 were 9,740,146 roubles more, and the estimated expenditure 12,510,514 roubles more than in 1883, and the total deficit on the year was estimated at 21,337,192 roubles. The unsatisfactory state of the Budget, however, does not seem to have had any prejudicial effect on the relations between the Government and the people, and

the address to the Emperor passed on January 22 by the Assembly of the Nobles of Moscow presented a marked contrast to the manifestations of discontent which had been made by that body in previous years. This address assured the Czar of the unbounded devotion of the Moscow nobility, thanked him for the "wise and gracious words" addressed by him to the nobles and the peasantry on the occasion of the coronation, and expressed the readiness of the nobles "faithfully and truly to serve the Czar, the autocrat of Russia, to observe his laws, and to uphold his sovereign rights," which they respect "as an historical legacy, as a guarantee for the welfare of the Fatherland, and as the corner-stone of the country's honour, strength, and unity." The address concluded by declaring that the consolidation of the relations between the noble and the peasant classes "will establish a bulwark which will be a support to the Emperor in all his undertakings, and form an unassailable stronghold against inimical intrigues."

About the middle of February Europe was startled by the news that Merv—the possession of which by Russia would, in the opinion of many distinguished officers and politicians, greatly facilitate Russian operations against the British rule in India—had submitted unconditionally to the Czar, thereby adding to the Russian territory a district about 19,000 English square miles in extent, and with 400,000 inhabitants. This event was the result of an expedition which had been sent by Russia in December, 1883, ostensibly to protect the Persians against the depredations of the Tekkes of Merv. The expedition, consisting of several companies of infantry, 250 Cossacks, and some artillery, marched to the frontier of the Merv district, and Captain Alikhanoff pushed on to Merv with an escort of twenty-five Cossacks and a letter for one of the Khans. After some negotiation, the Khan agreed to propose to the other chiefs that they should petition for annexation to Russia, renounce slavery, set free all slaves, and restore the booty taken from the Persians. These proposals were accepted, and on January 31 the Khans of the four tribes of the Merv Tekkes arrived at Askabad and swore allegiance to the Czar, for themselves and the whole population of Merv, in the presence of General Komaroff, the commander-in-chief of the Trans-Caspian district. By this acquisition the Russian frontier was advanced 185 miles in the direction of India, and Herat—called the "key of India" because the valley of the Heri-Rud here pierces the mountain barrier between Turkestan and Afghanistan, and gives easy access to the most practicable road to Candahar—was now only 200 miles from the Russian outposts. The annexation of Merv was speedily followed by that of Sarakhs, an important strategical position on the direct road from Askabad to Herat. A deputation from the Sarakhs Turcomans waited upon Prince Dondoukoff-Korsakoff, Governor-General of the Caucasus, at the beginning of June, and the Prince accepted their submission,

"solely to guard against internal troubles." The semi-official *Kavkaz*, of Tiflis, however, admitted that these annexations were important, inasmuch as they placed Russia in a position that could enable her "at any time to strike a blow at England." "By far the most advantageous policy," it continued, "for us to pursue in regard to India is not that of conquest, but of freeing the Hindoos from the British yoke. . . . Afghanistan, which separates us from India, may be compared in position to Roumania, which in like manner separated us from Turkey before the last war. Yet the one did not prevent our movement on the Danube, nor will the other stop our march on the Indus. Thus the conquest of Afghanistan is also quite unnecessary; more especially as, in regard to our position at Merv and on the Amou-Darya, that country is more defenceless than on the side of British India. . . . It is much easier for us to invade Afghanistan by way of Herat than for the English to do so by way of Quetta; they would have to scale the mountains, we merely to cross from one transverse range to another. It seems to us, therefore, that the subsidies paid by the English to the Afghans are merely so much money thrown away. Owing to its natural position, Afghanistan must inevitably take sides with a powerful army which, advancing upon India, should reach Herat from the north-west."

The Nihilist agitation continued to smoulder throughout the year without producing any tangible result. In February a number of proclamations from the so-called Constitutional party were largely circulated at St. Petersburg. The author of these documents appealed "to the many people in Russia who strive to remove the political serfdom of the people, or who at least sympathise with the movement for this object." They declared that they do not approve of the means adopted by the terrorist section of the Socialist party, and that they would carry on the struggle with the Government, not by violent means, but by propagating their opinions among the masses of the people. This they would do with their secret printing presses and other modes of influencing public opinion, and they would not abandon the contest until the present system is reversed, and the Russian nation is enabled to breathe freely. The chief features of the political programme enumerated by the "Constitutional party" on this occasion are—
1. Convocation of representatives of the people to a special consultative assembly for the discussion of the proposed new laws. The Czar would adopt the view of the majority or minority at his option, and the power of legislation would remain in his hands as hitherto. 2. Religious freedom and abolition of the censorship of the press. 3. An amnesty for all political offences.

The circulation of these proclamations stimulated the police to renewed efforts, and numerous arrests of persons connected with the Nihilist organisation were made in various parts of the Empire. Several artillery officers were captured at Novgorod and other

places. At Moscow the police discovered the first number of a Socialist paper called *The Student's Magazine*. Further outrages were committed upon the Jews at Nijni-Novgorod, and these, like the previous ones, were attributed to Socialist agitation. The most important discovery made by the police was that of a plot against the lives of the Emperor and the Czarevitch. A magistrate named Bardovski, who was implicated in this plot, was arrested at the beginning of July at Warsaw; but chiefs of the conspiracy were at Moscow. The police succeeded in capturing five of the principal conspirators, together with a large sum of money, several dynamite bombs, and some correspondence showing that since the Czar's coronation Moscow had been the seat of the executive committee of the Terrorist party. Finally, at the beginning of October, fourteen Nihilists, including a staff officer, a lieutenant-colonel, and three women, one of whom was the wife of a physician, were tried at St. Petersburg for high treason. One of the women, Vera Figner, was found guilty of being the agent of the Nihilist society, and of having taken part in the preparation of the bombs used in the assassination of the Emperor Alexander II., in the murder of General Strelnikoff at Odessa, and in the organisation of revolutionary societies in the army. She was sentenced to death, but the Emperor commuted the sentence to five years' imprisonment with hard labour. A lieutenant of the navy, Baron Alexander Stromberg, and a lieutenant of artillery, M. Rogatcheff, who had also taken a leading part in organising secret military societies, were hanged in the citadel on October 22.

The foreign policy of Russia, thanks mainly to the influence of MM. de Giers and Bunge, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and of Finance, has on the whole been pacific. In consequence of the agreement entered into with Germany and Austria at the beginning of the year, and afterwards ratified at the meeting of the three Emperors at Skierniewice, the rivalry between Russia and Austria in Eastern Europe ceased, and no more was heard of the machinations of Austrian and Russian agents in that region. In Central Asia, however, the danger of a collision between Russia and England became so palpable that it was arranged between the two countries that a commission should be despatched by them to propose a limitation of the Afghan frontier on the side of Russia. The English mission, under Sir Peter Lumsden, duly arrived at the place agreed upon, but the Russian commissioner, General Zelenoi, delayed his arrival on the plea of illness, and meanwhile, a Russian force advanced to Pul-i-Khatoun, a strong position on the road to Herat, more than ten miles beyond the district previously occupied by Russia. About the same time, the Russian Government, which had been in the habit of sending, with the permission of the Sultan, ships with criminals and recruits through the Bosphorus to Siberia, applied to the Porte for a standing authority to pass such ships through the Bosphorus at stated intervals. The British ambassador objected to this application.

having been informed that the so-called criminals and recruits in these ships were often effective soldiers, so that if Russia were allowed to employ such means for conveying her troops, they would be able to reach India through the Suez Canal in a shorter time than English troops; and the Porte then decided to grant the proposed authority only on the condition that the total number of the persons thus sent by ship through the Bosphorus shall not exceed 1,500 in any one year. The general policy of Russia with regard to India was discussed in a long letter published by the *Russ*, at the end of December, from General Soboleff, late Minister of War in Bulgaria, representing that it is a political necessity for Russia to make herself mistress of India. The Black Sea, says this letter, is a Russian sea with a gateway—the Bosphorus—through which Russia's enemies attack her rich possessions in the south. Russia has been striving to obtain possession of this gateway, in order to keep it closed against her enemies, but she always found England a strong and dangerous impediment to her project. England must therefore be compelled to see that it would be more profitable to her to become Russia's friend than her foe. This can only be done by striking England at the heart, namely, in India. "A campaign in India would cost five times less than the expense of the late Russo-Turkish war, besides which it would take place in Asia, where neither Austria nor Germany would move a finger." Whoever deals England a blow in India "sounds her death-knell," for England's immense trade in the East is entirely dependent on her possession of India. If England were really to become Russia's friend, and did not oppose her policy on the Bosphorus, Russia would even support British rule in India. On the other hand, the difficulty of a campaign in India would not be so great as is sometimes imagined. "If Russia proclaimed a liberation of the natives of India from the English yoke, leaving them their independence when the English should be routed, millions of Indians would at once come over to the side of Russia." Such sentiments cannot, of course, be attributed to the Russian Government or to the Russian nation, merely because they have been expressed by a Russian general; but it is certainly noteworthy that they have been allowed to appear in a Russian paper under the most stringent newspaper censorship in Europe.

III. TURKEY AND THE MINOR STATES OF EASTERN EUROPE.

The centre of political interest in Eastern Europe during the first quarter of the year was the new kingdom of Servia. The Cristitch Ministry, after its successful suppression of the rising of the past autumn, seemed to be firmly established in office, and the result of the general elections for the Skouptchina, which took place February 9, tended to confirm this view. The Ministry

carefully abstained from any interference with the elections, and some officials who took an active part in the contest were summarily dismissed. Yet the Opposition, composed of Radicals under the ex-Minister Ristitch, and Liberals under the ex-Minister Pirotchanatz, only obtained 21 seats, while the Progressists, who had coalesced with the ministerial party under the name of "the friends of order," obtained 71 seats. A difficulty, however, arose as to the 44 members who, under the Servian constitution, are not elected by the people, but appointed by the Ministry. M. Cristitch, true to his policy of securing for the Government these who were in his view the best administrators, irrespectively of party, wished to appoint to the vacant seats men who had no party ties, while the Progressists insisted on at least one half of these seats being given to men of their party. Upon this M. Cristitch resigned, and the King, finding it impossible to bring about a compromise, sent for the Progressist leader, M. Garaschanin, Servian envoy at Vienna, and a staunch advocate of friendly relations with Austria. M. Garaschanin appointed to his Cabinet several of the members of the late Pirotchanatz Ministry, and thereby secured a majority of 140 in a House of 174. This majority may be said accurately to represent the prevailing tendencies of the country, which is strongly opposed to the philo-Russian policy of M. Ristitch and his friends, and was beginning to be somewhat alarmed at the Bismarckian ways of M. Cristitch. The Skouptchina then proceeded with the work of the session, the most important incident of which was the Army Reorganisation Bill. The Servian Army is in future to consist of fifteen battalions of regulars, and 120 battalions of militia, amounting in all to 160,000 men.

At the end of March a parliamentary crisis broke out in Greece. The Opposition, finding itself powerless to resist the growing influence of the Premier, M. Tricoupis, who commanded so large a majority in the Chamber that he succeeded in passing all the measures he brought before it, determined to absent itself from the sittings in a body on the first opportunity. The occasion soon arose. By a resolution passed in the Chamber the sittings were to last from two to eight P.M. daily; but on March 21 a heated discussion took place on some extraordinary credits which had been demanded by the Government, and the members of the Opposition left the House when the debate closed at half-past eight. The Ministerialists, however, remained, and being in sufficient numbers to form a quorum, they sat for two hours longer, and passed about thirty Government Bills. This proceeding was objected to on the following day by M. Deliyannis, the leader of the Opposition, who demanded that the decisions taken by the Chamber after the Opposition had left should be declared null and void; and his demand having been refused, he announced that it would no longer be possible for him and his friends to take part in the proceedings of the Chamber. He then left the House with

seventy of his adherents, but ten members of the Opposition, comprising two Republicans and eight "Independents," remained, and with their help the Ministerialists passed most of the Government Bills which were still in arrear. Meanwhile there was a good deal of discontent in the country, which might have proved dangerous to the Government if the Opposition had been more united. It was asserted that the expenditure had doubled within the past four years, and that the taxes had proportionally increased; that immense sums were being wasted in armaments and in providing places for M. Tricoupis's supporters; that the actual receipts had fallen short of the amount estimated by 20,000,000 drachmas; and that the accounts of the year would show a deficit of 25,000,000 drachmas, or one-fourth of the entire expenditure of the country.

In Turkey two important governorships—those of Eastern Roumelia and of Crete—fell vacant at the beginning of the year. Aleko Pasha, whose coquettings with the revolutionary party in Eastern Roumelia had rendered his reappointment impossible, obtained no support from any of the Powers, and he was succeeded by M. Christovitch, his principal Minister and deputy. M. Christovitch is a Bulgarian by birth, was educated in Paris, and then entered the service of the Sultan, in which he rose to the rank of President of the first civil tribunal at Constantinople. When Eastern Roumelia became an autonomous province under the Treaty of Berlin, M. Christovitch was appointed director of the internal administration. His candidature was supported mainly by the Russian Government, which of late years had become opposed to the spread of revolutionary tendencies in Eastern Roumelia; and as, while giving no encouragement to these tendencies, M. Christovitch had contrived to render himself popular in the country, his appointment to the governor-generalship, together with the rank of Grand Vizier, was approved by the Sultan with the unanimous consent of the Powers (May 10). In Crete the old antagonism between the Turkish and Greek populations was intensified by a report that, Photiades Pasha's term of office having expired, a Mussulman governor, Halil Rifaat Pasha, was to be appointed to succeed him. Some serious riots took place in the island, and a telegraphic despatch, signed by all the Christian members of the Cretan Assembly, was sent to Lord Dufferin, protesting against the proposed appointment. Another despatch was at the same time addressed by them to the Sultan, in which they alleged that the disturbed condition of Crete was caused by the delay in the settlement of local questions, the encroachments on the privileges of the Church, and the fact that the Patriarch had not been reinstated in his post. In consequence of these representations, and similar ones from the diplomatic body at Constantinople, the Sultan abandoned his intention of appointing Halil Rifaat Pasha to Crete, and Photiades Pasha was reappointed for a further term of five years (March 6). This, however, did not

remove the chief grievance of which the Greeks in Crete and other parts of Turkey complained, viz., that the Porte claimed the right of arresting and trying before the ordinary Ottoman tribunals any priest accused of an offence against the common law. On this point the Porte was inflexible, and the situation became so strained, the Russian Government having interfered on behalf of the Greeks, that Aarifi Pasha, the Turkish Foreign Minister, resigned (April 17). He was succeeded by Assym Pasha, the Minister of Justice; a new Patriarch, Joachim IV. of Dercon, on the Bosphorus, was then elected, and the Porte abandoned its former claim to bring Greek priests for trial before civil tribunals.

In Roumania the Opposition, led by M. Cogalniceano, continued its bitter attacks on the Government, and in the first half of the year it withdrew itself altogether from the representative assembly and declared that it would not take part in the coming elections, as it regarded the changes which had been effected in the constitution and the creation of the Crown domains as illegal. The elections took place with perfect tranquillity and order. M. Cogalniceano and M. Demeter Bratiano, brother of the Premier, and one of the most eager of his political opponents, were re-elected, but did not succeed in forming a strong party in the House, and the result was that the Liberals under M. Jon Bratiano, the Premier, were more numerous than before. This was to some extent due to the change in the mode of election as originally prescribed by the Constitution. Formerly the electors were divided into four classes—county proprietors of land, town proprietors of land, professional men (including merchants and manufacturers), and peasants—each of which voted independently of the others; while now there are only three classes, with a much lower franchise qualification, thereby entirely doing away with the influence of the rich landed proprietors. The secrecy of voting, too, was assisted by the adoption of the Belgian voting system, under which the elector is provided with a voting paper and an envelope and goes into a closed room into which no one else is admitted, where he writes the name of the candidate for whom he wishes to vote, and then places the paper in the envelope, and fastens it himself before it is thrown into the ballot-box.

Immediately after the elections the Prime Minister, in accordance with a declaration which he had previously made, that he would leave it to the majority in the Parliament, elected under the new law, to declare the men in whom they would have confidence as Ministers, placed his resignation and that of the other members of the Cabinet in the King's hands. The King then consulted the Presidents of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the great majority of the senators and deputies having declared in writing that M. Jon Bratiano possesses the full confidence of the country, the King decided that the existing Ministry should remain in office.

In Bulgaria, on the other hand, the new Radical Ministry of M. Karaveloff was very unpopular, and M. Zankoff, the ex-Premier, busily exerted himself to overthrow it. At the beginning of August he issued a manifesto to the Liberal party, repudiating all connection with the "upstart Radicalism," which he declared was threatening not only the newly-won constitutional freedom and national rights of Bulgaria, but even the whole future of the principality. The strong party feeling produced by this manifesto and by the bitter hatred of the Conservatives for the Karaveloff Ministry, culminated in a disgraceful outrage unprecedented in the annals of parliamentary government. On December 20 M. Sivaceff, a member of the Opposition, accused M. Karaveloff of sharing with Russian contractors the profits of the contract for the Zaribrod-Vakarel railway. M. Karaveloff called upon the President to silence his accuser, but the President declined to do so, upon which about thirty members of the government party rushed to the tribune and attacked M. Sivaceff, who was struck down and nearly killed, the tribune breaking under the weight of the combatants. On the following morning the Conservatives held a meeting to protest against the outrage; but the Ministerialists broke into the hall, expelled the Conservatives, and passed a vote of confidence in the Ministry, after which they proceeded to the palace of Prince Alexander, who received a deputation from them, and accepted a copy of the resolution they had passed.

Various little difficulties occurred during the year between Turkey and the other powers. In July the Porte applied to the Powers for the suppression of the foreign post-offices in Turkey, and this request having been refused, it set up a postal service of its own, which, however, utterly failed in competing with the foreign services. In August it again came into conflict with the ambassadors, by adding seven Turkish surgeons to the board of the International Sanitary Council, which deals with questions of quarantine, &c. The ambassadors protested, and the Turkish surgeons were ultimately withdrawn. The long standing dispute with the Austrian Government, too, as to the failure of the Porte to meet its engagements with regard to the establishment of a junction between the Austrian and the Turkish railways, had not been settled at the end of the year; and a feeling of soreness towards England still prevailed at the Porte in consequence of her action in the Dulcigno and Egyptian questions. The smaller Eastern States, on the other hand, being relieved from the presence of Russian influence, now that Russia had agreed not to interfere any further with their development, on the whole maintained friendly relations with each other and with Austria, which were strengthened by the visit in the spring of the Austrian Crown Prince to their capitals, and in September of the King and Queen of Servia to Vienna and of the King of Roumania to Belgrade. The only incident which disturbed the general harmony among the Danubian States was the dispute between Servia

and Bulgaria at the beginning of June, owing to the return to Servia of a number of Servian fugitives who had taken part in the late Servian insurrection, and, notwithstanding the protests of the Servian Government, had been allowed to pass the winter in Bulgarian towns bordering on Servian territory. These persons, after crossing the frontier, burnt the house of the Mayor of Boutchi, killed the Mayor of Boutchova and three other persons who had given evidence against the insurgents, and established themselves in a strong position on Mount Drevnik, thereby threatening the whole of the Timok district. The Servian Government made representations to Bulgaria on the subject, but the Premier curtly replied that Bulgarian remonstrances had been disregarded in frontier disputes of a similar kind, and directed the Prefect of Widdin to occupy the frontier post of Bregovo, near Negotin, driving out four Servian guards who occupied the post. This caused a further complication, as there had been a coolness between the two countries since the Treaty of Berlin, both being disappointed at the line of frontier between them which was laid down by that Treaty. Servia considered that she had a claim to Widdin, while Bulgaria was dissatisfied because she had not been given Pirot and Nisch, which are towns inhabited chiefly by Bulgarians. Moreover, Russia had, previously to the agreement between the three Emperors in the present year, specially favoured the Bulgarians, while Servia had been under the protection of Austria, who concluded a commercial treaty with her, which was very prejudicial to the cattle trade of Bulgaria. The ground was therefore well prepared for a serious quarrel which under other circumstances might have led to international complications; and on June 11, Servia recalled her diplomatic agent from Sofia. But the Powers interfered on the initiative of Prince Bismarck, and no further hostile step was taken on either side, though the matter still remained unsettled at the end of the year.

CHAPTER IV.

MINOR STATES OF EUROPE.

- I. BELGIUM. II. NETHERLANDS. III. SWITZERLAND. IV. SPAIN.
V. PORTUGAL. VI. DENMARK. VII. NORWAY. VIII. SWEDEN.

1. BELGIUM.

EVENTS of no small importance marked the course of the year in Belgium, culminating in the complete overthrow of the Liberals and the accession of a Catholic Ministry. At the close of 1884, the exact results of the new electoral law adopted by the Chambers during the previous session were not yet known; b

in the beginning of 1885, it appeared from the explanations given to the Chambers by the Minister of the Interior, that the new law had created two new classes of electors—those who by virtue of their educational qualifications, as defined by the law, had obtained the right to vote, and those who had acquired it by successfully passing the requisite examination. To the first class belong 93,213 electors, 43,000 of whom were already inscribed on the electoral roll, but who now figured as electors for life, and whose right of vote would no longer depend on variations of their rating qualification. The second class at the outstart comprised 50,828 new electors, but this number will naturally increase every year, in proportion as the new candidates for examination attain the required age of twenty-one.

The Liberals, who had inaugurated and carried this important reform in spite of the violent opposition of the Catholics, entertained great hopes that it would be favourable to their cause. These hopes were, however, completely destroyed by the provincial elections which took place in May throughout the country. The Liberals were defeated almost everywhere, and often with crushing majorities, even in districts where they had hitherto been returned by important majorities. In the province of Luxembourg alone they gained a few new seats, thereby overthrowing its Catholic representation; but in the eight other provinces their losses were overwhelming.

Three weeks later the elections for the renewal of half the members of the Legislative Chambers took place. The results as shown in the the five provinces were disastrous for the Liberals. The former Chamber had contained 79 Liberal and 59 Clerical members; after the elections the proportion was 86 Clericals to 52 Liberals, the former thus having a majority of 34. The Liberal defeats were spread over the whole of the districts polled; but the most sensible blow was given to the cause at Brussels, where the 16 representatives were replaced by Catholic deputies, or rather by so-called Independents, who, as subsequent events proved, constantly voted with the Clerical party. In addition two of the Ministers, M. van Humbeek, Minister of Public Instruction, and M. Olin, Minister of Public Works, were not re-elected as deputies. The Liberal Cabinet at once resigned, and the King deputed the leader of the Catholic party, M. Malou, to form a new Ministry. Its first act was to suppress the Ministry of Public Instruction, which was affiliated to the Ministry of the Interior, as it had been previous to the passing of the law of 1879. The Ministry of Public Works was also suppressed and united with that of the Interior. The railways were placed under the control of a special department, and a new Ministry of Commerce, Agriculture, and Fine Arts was created. The new Cabinet, chosen amongst the most prominent members of the Catholic party, was composed as follows: M. Malou, President of the Council and Minister of

Finance ; M. Jacobs, Interior and Public Instruction ; M. Wæste, Justice ; M. de Moreau, Foreign Affairs ; M. Vandenpeereboom, Railways ; M. Beernaert, Commerce, Agriculture, and Fine Arts ; and General Pontus, War.

The sudden and irresistible current of opinion, by which the overthrow of the Liberals was brought about, was traceable to several causes. It was not against the Education Act of 1879 that the electors voted, for since it had become law the country had been twice consulted—in 1880 and 1882—and on both occasions had supported the Liberal Cabinet. In all probability purely material questions played a dominant part in the change. The taxes proposed by the Liberal Ministry and voted by the Chambers had given rise to general discontent, whilst on the very eve of the elections, the Government had put forward a necessary but most unpopular proposal for the organisation of a military reserve. The country unhesitatingly declared its unwillingness to make greater sacrifices for military expenses, and the new force of 30,000 men, proposed by the Cabinet, greatly incensed a large body of electors. Another section of the Liberals voted against the Government on the ground of its inconsistent policy towards the higher clergy. But more than anything else, the pretensions of the Extreme Left to impose on the Government a project of revision of the Constitution, to which the country was absolutely hostile, brought about the overthrow of the Liberal party as the dominant power. The Radicals in this way created disunion amongst the Brussels Liberals, and decided numerous moderate Liberals to vote with the Catholics.

Almost immediately after its constitution, the new Ministry gave signs that they were decided to uphold vigorously the claims of the Clerical party, and would not repeat the undecided, hesitating policy adopted by M. Malou in 1870, and continued until his overthrow in 1878. They began by summarily dismissing two provincial governors, who were specially known as ardent Liberals, and they followed up this display of vigour by the suspension and dismissal of numerous subordinate officials. Whilst, however, the Chamber of Representatives had been so completely changed in its composition, the Senate had not been modified, and there remained in that body a Liberal majority of six, sufficient to render the problem of legislation insoluble. Under these circumstances, therefore, the Government dissolved the Senate so that fresh elections took place throughout the entire country for the complete renewal of the Upper Chamber. The triumph of the Catholics was on this occasion as decided as in the partial renewal of the other Chamber, and they returned to the Senate with a majority of seventeen. But on this occasion the Brussels electors voted for the Liberals instead of for the Catholics ; so that at three weeks' interval almost identical voters had returned sixteen Catholic representatives, and eight Liberal senators. On the other hand, it must be conceded that at the senatorial elections

the majorities obtained by the Catholics almost everywhere showed a falling off, whereas the Liberal candidates, although defeated, showed a marked gain in the number of votes polled.

Nevertheless, the Ministry was now at the head of the imposing majority in both Chambers, and, in accordance with the openly expressed desires of the whole of the Clerical party, abrogated the law of 1879, and proposed a new project of law on Public Instruction, which was discussed and voted by the Chambers assembled for that purpose in an extraordinary session.

The new law was essentially one of decentralisation, and its principal feature was the handing over to local bodies (*communes*) all interests concerning primary instruction. According to the terms of the law, there must exist in each commune at least one communal school, established in an appropriate building, unless there be in the commune one or several free schools adopted by the Government, in which case the commune would be freed from the obligation of establishing or maintaining a communal school. If, however, twenty parents of children of school age (six to fourteen, according to the law) should demand it, the commune would be obliged to establish a communal school, regardless of the existing school accommodation. As to the number of schools and teachers, each commune was left entirely free to act as it chose. The programme of studies common to all the schools, whether communal or adopted, remained unaltered, except so far as related to instruction in religion and ethics, which was no longer made compulsory. The communal authorities, however, might include these two branches in the programme of their respective primary schools, on the condition that instruction therein should be given at the beginning or at the end of the other lessons. Furthermore, should twenty parents apply to have their children dispensed from following the lesson in ethics or religion, the Government might call upon the commune to create special classes for those children who wished for such instruction. On the other hand, if the commune had not included religion in its programme, and prevented its being taught in the school by the priest or by a person designated by him, the Government might adopt one or more free schools in the district where religious instruction would be given in accordance with the parent's desire. The only condition required from a free school desirous of being adopted and subsidised either by the commune or the Government, was that it should accept the programme of the official schools, and submit to State inspection. The expenses of primary instruction in Belgium are defrayed by the communes, the provinces being obliged to contribute towards them in certain fixed proportions; the State's intervention in the matter being purely facultative, and completely subordinated to the will of the Minister or of the Government of the day. The communes being at liberty to determine the number of their schools, are equally free to suppress those already established and to replace them by

adopted schools. In this case, the teachers placed *en disponibilité* were to receive a salary in every case considerably reduced, with a minimum, however, of 750 francs per annum.

This law met with determined opposition from the Liberal party, who considered it as the total destruction of the work they had been pursuing for six years. The Communal Councils of several hundreds of communes addressed protests to the Legislative Chambers; and, on the proposition of the burgomasters of Brussels and Antwerp, a league of communes was formed, under the name of *Compromis des Communes*. This league drew up a petition, which was presented to the King, earnestly begging his Majesty not to give his sanction to the new law. The petition bore the signatures of 4,171 burgomasters and communal councillors, representing 829 communes and 2,700,000 inhabitants. The Federation of Belgian Liberals, moreover, organised an imposing public manifestation at Brussels, in the course of which a fresh petition, signed by thousands of Liberals, was presented to the King, also entreating him not to sanction the measure.

The Catholics, on their side, energetically defended their law, and presented numerous petitions to the King, asking him not to heed the Liberal protests, and reminding him that in 1879 he had sanctioned the Education Bill proposed by the Liberals, although it had been greatly opposed by their political adversaries, and was far from having been passed by so large a majority of the Legislative Chambers as the present Bill. A manifestation at Brussels, a counterpart of the Liberal one, was also organised by the Catholics, and was quite as numerously attended. Unfortunately the Brussels population, who, in spite of the result of the June elections, adhered to Liberal opinions, were so far forgetful of true Liberalism in that they attacked the procession as it passed through the streets; and, in spite of the utmost efforts of the police and of the whole of the Civic Guard, serious injuries were inflicted, and the clerical display was completely broken up. This state of tension continued for some days after the Brussels disturbances; a renewal of quarrels there and elsewhere was reported, and the situation for a short time was so critical that a civil war was seriously apprehended.

While these events were taking place, the Senate voted the Education Bill, and the King, strictly adhering to his constitutional duties, gave his sanction to the new law.

From the morrow of their defeat in the summer the Liberals had never ceased declaring that the country did not in reality support the Clerical Government, and disapproved of its Education Bill, and that, had the electors known beforehand the use the Catholics would make of the power they obtained, they never would have been elected. The correctness of these views was shortly afterwards put to the test. Elections for the renewal of the Communal Councils throughout the whole country took place on October 29, and the triumph of the Liberal party was so great that

a few days later M. Jacobs and M. Woeste, whom public opinion designed as the real authors of the Education Bill, were obliged to resign their posts as ministers, and M. Malou followed his two colleagues in their retreat. Such an undisguised and decided explosion of public opinion had not been witnessed in Belgium since 1857, when the Catholic Cabinet, presided over by M. de Decker, had been overthrown, after the communal elections, on account of the law on the convents.

The modifications of the Ministry, necessitated by the withdrawal of three of its members, rendered a general reconstruction advisable. M. Beernaert became President of the Council and Minister of Finances; M. de Moreau, of Commerce, Agriculture, and Fine Arts; Prince de Caraman-Chimay, of Foreign Affairs; M. Thonissen took the Interior and Public Instruction; M. Vandenepeereboom, Railways; General Pontus, War; and M. de Volder, Justice—this last-named having no seat in either Chamber. Some modifications were made in the Education Law, and certain points, which the Liberals had particularly opposed, were altered. For instance, exemption of a commune from the duty of providing a public school would only be accorded under very exceptional circumstances; in all subventioned schools the teachers were to be, as in communal schools, Belgians by birth; and the minimum pension of communal teachers, *en disponibilité*, was raised from 750 to 1,000 francs.

Immediately after the accession of the Catholic Cabinet, M. de Moreau, Minister for Foreign Affairs, according to the promise made by the clerical leaders while they were in minority, proposed a resolution re-establishing diplomatic relations between Belgium and the Holy See. The Chambers voted a sum of 31,000 francs for this object, and simultaneously the Pope nominated Mgr. Rotelli Nuncio at Brussels. But, although these decisions were taken in August, for some unexplained reasons neither envoy had presented his credentials at their respective courts.

Reference has already been made to the plan of an Army Reserve, proposed by the Liberal Cabinet, under very strong pressure from the King. When the Catholics came into power they also found it incumbent on them to include some such scheme in their programme. General Pontus, the Minister for War, was entirely favourable to the creation of a national reserve, but he admitted, on being questioned by a member of the Left, that although his proposals were ready, he could not bring them forward, being convinced that in neither Chamber would a majority be found disposed to impose on the country an increase of the military charges. He added, however, that if, in a short time, he had not converted the majority to his views, he could no longer keep his post as minister.

Shortly before the overthrow of the Liberals, M. Grawe, then Minister of Finance, had presented the Budget for 1885, which,

according to his provisions, and with the aid of the taxes voted during the previous year, disclosed a deficit of 3,000,000 fr. His successor, M. Beernaert, by economies practised mostly on public instruction and public works, was able to present a Budget which showed a slight surplus of 200,000 fr.; but the time had not arrived, when the year closed, to determine how far the optimist anticipations of the Catholic financier were borne out by the result.

II. THE NETHERLANDS.

The death of the Prince of Orange, the last male descendant of the House of Orange-Nassau, having brought into prominence the serious question of the succession to the throne of Holland, it is not surprising to find that much of the legislative action of the year has been concentrated on this point. The reigning King having no male issue or male relation descending from the head of the dynasty, the Crown, by Art. 15 of the Dutch Constitution, would pass to the King's eldest daughter. By his second marriage, with Queen Emma, Princess of Waldeck-Pyrmont, William III. has one daughter, Princess Wilhelmina, born in 1880, and who therefore would not attain her majority until 1898. It became, therefore, the duty of the States-General to provide for the guardianship of the future queen, as well as for the regency. The Constitution (Art. 35) declares that, during minority, the sovereign is under the guardianship of a council, composed of certain members of the royal family and certain State dignitaries. This guardianship and the regency, by special Bills, must both be voted by both the Chambers during the lifetime of the King, in anticipation of his successor's minority.

But on the present occasion the very probable eventuality of a regency lasting for several years, rendered necessary the revision of Art. 198 of the Constitution, which declares that no change whatever in the fundamental law or in the order of succession to the throne can be made during a regency.

At the time of the last revision of the Constitution in 1848, the royal family was so widespread that nothing pointed to the possibility of a regency, so that this Art. 198 had no practical importance. But at the present time, in view of the inevitable need of revision to which several important articles of the Constitution, relative to electoral, military questions, &c., were exposed, it was therefore, as M. Heemskerk stated before the Chambers, prudent to annul by legal ways the obstacle to such revision.

This same Article, moreover, not only prevents the revision of any fundamental law, but it also forbids the discussion of any change in the order of succession to the throne. The first question, therefore, which arose was whether this latter part of Art. 198 should be maintained, or whether the whole Article should be simply abolished, thereby permitting that during a regency the

order of succession might be completely modified by the enactment of a new law on this important subject. The President of the Cabinet, M. Heemskerk, fully apprehended the importance of the question, and plainly stated it before the Chambers: "It is a very sad, but very possible eventuality that a foreign prince or princess might inherit the throne, and it might also happen that foreign nations would consider a regency as a weak Government. It is, therefore, necessary that those having the guardianship of the monarchy may be able to say they are in the legal impossibility of making any change in the order of succession, and that that question must be reserved until the sovereign's majority." The Government accordingly proposed that the revised text of the Art. 198 should stand thus:—"No change can be made to the order of succession to the throne during a regency."

The Second Chamber adopted this proposal by 68 against 14, and the First Chamber of the States-General by 31 against 3. As to the eventual regency of the Netherlands, it was confided by the united Chambers (by 97 against 3) to Queen Emma.

After the promulgation of this law, both Chambers were dissolved; but the subsequent elections did not show any serious change in the respective positions of the two principal parties, although the Liberal majority was slightly diminished.

The Commission appointed in 1883 to study the question of the revision of the Constitution, published the results of their deliberations. They drew up no definite scheme of their own, fit to be submitted to the Chambers, but they prepared materials for the purpose by collecting various opinions on the subject, and by giving their advice on the different points most needing a revision.

The financial position was still unsatisfactory; the general Budget for 1885 disclosed a deficit of 15,000,000 florins. To meet this the Government proposed to increase the taxes on tobacco, and to revise those on stamps. The States-General, moreover, had under consideration a Bill for the better organisation of State lotteries, which would increase the profitability on them to the State from 473,000 to 588,400 florins.

A slight change occurred in the composition of the Cabinet at the beginning of the year. Vice-Admiral Geerling was, at his own request, relieved of his functions of Minister of the Marine, and replaced by M. van Erp Taalman Kip, former Minister of the Marine in the Rochussen Cabinet. Differences of opinion concerning promotions in the army seem to have been the cause of the step taken by Adm. Geerling.

The nomination of M. O. van Rees to the post of Governor-General of the East Indies left vacant the Presidency of the Second Chamber. This was, after a heated election, conferred on M. Cremers, a Liberal, to whom the Conservatives had opposed Count Schimmelpennink van der Oye.

The situation at Atchin was but little changed during the year,

causing considerable anxiety to the Government. The English s.s. *Nisero* having been shipwrecked on the coast of Tenem, the rajah of that province, an ally of the Sultan of Atchin, made the crew prisoners, demanding a large sum for the men's ransom. The Government of the East Indies, presided over by M. O. van Rees, successor to M. S'Jacob, organised an expedition against the rajah in order to deliver the prisoners. This, however, was unsuccessful, and the English Government then proposed to Holland to unite with her in punishing the rajah. This intervention of a foreign power in the affairs of Holland was not kindly accepted by the Chambers, and there were several interpellations on the subject. Finally, however, the Government acceded to the English proposal; but before the Anglo-Dutch ultimatum, threatening him with war if he did not give up his prisoners, reached him, the rajah of Tenem submitted to the will of the two nations, and on September 11 the Governor of Atchin conducted back to Kottaradja all the survivors of the crew of the *Nisero*. The rajah, moreover, unreservedly submitted himself to the Dutch Government. This, however, did not put an end to the troubles of Holland at Atchin, for the whole coast becoming infested by Atchinese pirates, who claimed the name and privileges of belligerents, almost daily fighting was reported.

In the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg the elections for the Chamber proved a complete victory for the Liberal party, who gained a few new seats, and were thus able to re-elect their candidate, the former President of the Chamber, M. Lessel, by 33 against 7 votes, a division which indicated with fair correctness the actual relations of parties in the Chamber.

III. SWITZERLAND.

The movement for a revision of the Cantonal Constitutions, which began in Berne, soon extended itself to Vaud. The movement was doubtless precipitated as much by financial irregularities as by the violence and despotic pretensions of the Radical party. The lawsuits arising out of financial questions had shown the serious abuses arising from the eligibility of administrative functionaries as deputies to the Federal Council. In consequence a petition was got up and signed by 18,000 citizens, calling for a law to prohibit any Cantonal officer from being elected a member of the Federal Council. This law, submitted to the popular vote, was adopted by 20,944 against 20,274, the Radicals violently opposing it. This appeal to the people was followed by another, demanding a revision of the Constitution, and by 20,000 against 8,000 it was decided that this work should be performed by an *Assemblée Constituante*. The elections to this Assembly gave, as was anticipated, a majority to the Radicals, but the Moderate Liberals, who had also been successful in increasing the number of their representatives, were strong enough and compact enough to prevent the ultra-Radical members from imposing their views

on the rest of the majority. A Commission of 35 members was chosen to draw up a draft project of Constitution, but the results of its labours had not been reported before the close of the year.

The canton of Aargau, where a revision of the Constitution was also voted—but by a narrow majority—showed in a still more marked way the reaction, and the *Assemblée Constituante*, issuing from the subsequent elections, fairly represented the divided state of public opinion, both parties possessing an equal number of representatives, Radicals on the one side, Moderate Liberals and Catholics on the other.

Four other important measures were, in the course of the year, submitted to popular vote. Of them the most noteworthy related to the addition to the Federal Penal Code of an article giving the Federal Council the right of transferring cases from one jurisdiction to another, if the independence or impartiality of the cantonal courts of law were suspected on the ground of political bias. The Catholic party opposed the Bill, got up a petition which rapidly obtained over 80,000 signatures, and thereby all the Bills were submitted to the popular *referendum*, when they were all rejected, against the advice of the National Council, which had admitted them to be good and useful.

In the canton of Basle there had existed, for very many years, besides the "town" schools, a certain number of Catholic schools, to which were attached 42 teachers of both sexes, giving instruction to some 1,800 children. Complaints having arisen as to the real value of the teaching given, the Cantonal Government (which, according to the Constitution, is responsible for primary instruction), insisted that the teachers should produce their certificates of capacity; only five or six having been able to comply with this requirement, the Government at once laid before the Cantonal Council a proposition to withdraw from an uncertificated teacher the right of giving instruction. This was adopted by the Cantonal Council; and subsequently the people, by 4,479 against 2,910, ratified this decision. In the Federal Council, the Catholics somewhat rashly brought forward the question, with the result, however, of obtaining from that body an approval of the Government of Basle, and the subsequent closing of those schools where the teachers proved recalcitrant.

The question of the right of asylum accorded to Anarchists again occupied public opinion. The Austro-Hungarian Government having addressed the Federal Council a friendly note relative to the doings of the Anarchists, the German and Russian Ministers resident received instructions from their respective Governments to support the demands of Austria. The Federal Council, in reply, intimated its intention to leave the case to the appreciation of the Cantonal judiciary authorities, and not to look upon the acts committed by the Anarchists as political crimes. In other words, the arrested individuals would be considered as offenders against the Common Law, who, if their culpability were proved, would be

treated in accordance with the terms of existing extradition treaties. The Federal Council moreover decided that any Anarchist expelled from a canton by a judiciary sentence was thereby expelled from the whole of Swiss territory. In pursuance of this decision, several German and Austrian Anarchists were forced to quit Switzerland, but were not given up to their Governments, as there were no actual proofs of their implication in the crimes imputed to them.

A slight misunderstanding occurred between the Swiss and Italian Governments, arising out of the proceedings of the Italian Custom-house officers, who on several occasions had crossed at different places into the canton of Tessin in pursuit of smugglers. In vain the local authorities protested against these frequent violations of Swiss territory, and gave formal orders to the gendarmes to repel and, if needful, to arrest the Custom-house officers found within its limits. The Federal Council moreover at length considered it necessary to notify to the Italian Government the state of things, and the result was an exchange of notes of a rather unpleasant character between the two Governments. In the midst of this correspondence, a political fact of some importance aggravated the position. M. Grecchi, Italian Consul in the canton of Tessin, was proved to have taken an active part in bringing out a pamphlet recommending the annexation of the Ticinese to Italy. To the Swiss remonstrances the Italian Cabinet paid but small attention; whereupon the Federal Council announced to the Italian Government that the Consul's exequatur should be forthwith withdrawn unless M. Grecchi did not spontaneously give up his post of Consul, or were not at once recalled by his Government.

The elections for the renewal of the National Council, which took place in October, did not bring any important change in the respective positions of the parties, the Radicals maintaining their majority in the cantons of Berne, Vaud, Tessin, S. Gall, and Zurich. In the canton of Geneva alone the Radicals met with a serious defeat, losing a great number of seats, their former crushing majority being reduced to three. In this canton, however, financial rather than political questions were uppermost in the voters' minds, for not only were the taxes in that canton extremely heavy, but there was a deficit of nearly a million francs on the current year. In the course of the year Herr Schenk and M. Deutcher, both Radicals, were respectively elected President and Vice-President of the Swiss Confederation for the ensuing year.

IV. SPAIN.

The recurrence of a political crisis with the opening year seemed inevitable to all who were watching the course of events in the Spanish Peninsula, and it was believed that the first trial of strength would be on the reply to the speech from the throne, as

drafted by the Cabinet, and opposed by a counter-draft presented by the Fusionistas, headed by Señor Sagasta. The main features of the former were universal suffrage and constitutional reform, whilst the counter project denounced both one and the other, alleging that such changes were not required by public opinion. The latter having been read in the Congress (January 3), the debates on the address commenced and lasted a fortnight, in the course of which Señor Posada Herrera, the Premier, stated that every attempt had been made at conciliation, but without success, on account of the systematic opposition with which it had been met. He said that universal suffrage was a "logical consequence" of the rights of the Spanish people; but that Government did not contemplate pushing forward constitutional reform for the present. The two speeches which created most sensation were those delivered by Señor Castelar (January 14 and 15), wherein he spoke for the Constitution of 1869, and, among other things, condemned the King's visit to Germany, where, as he contemptuously put it, his Majesty had been welcomed "like a King of Servia." The other event was Señor Martos' speech (January 16), in which, after advocating compulsory military service, he formally declared his adhesion to the monarchy of Alphonso XII., and this open and long-looked-for profession of faith was warmly approved by all monarchical parties. The vote was then taken (January 17) and was adverse to the Ministry; the counter address of the Sagastistas being passed by 221 against 126 in spite of the opposition of the Dynastic Left and Conservative Republicans.

In face of the King's refusal to grant a dissolution, the Cabinet had no option but to resign; and—as had been foreseen from the disorganised state of the Opposition ranks—power fell into the hands of the Conservatives. Señor Canovas del Castillo was called upon to organise a new Cabinet (January 18), which he seems to have expected and been prepared for, as on the same day it was completed and approved by the King, thus: Canovas, President; Elduayen, Foreign Affairs; General Quesada, War; Romero Robledo, Home; Cos-Gayon, Finance; Luis Silvela, Justice; Pidal, Public Works; Vice-Admiral Antequera, Navy; and Valdosa, Colonies. The new Ministry announced no programme, but an officious note which was published, hinted at a "liberal" policy, with an energetic maintenance of order and enforced respect to the institutions of the country, and abstention from any adventurous foreign policy. The next day the Cortes were closed.

The Liberal parties were probably not surprised at the issue brought about by their own unsettled state and consequent weakness; for, in a meeting, the outgoing Ministers, the Constitutionals and the supporters of Señor Sagasta determined on a policy of "moderate" opposition; so that the chief opponents of the Cabinet were the advanced Republicans. Their attempt to celebrate the anniversary of the Republic (February 10) was inter-

dicted, and some who, despite this, had met at the Alhambra theatre were dispersed. The Press, moreover, although it had little cause for gratitude towards the last two Administrations, was dealt with more severely than ever, notwithstanding the press law reforms, which had been carried out in its behalf. Prosecutions became so frequent that at length a meeting of newspaper editors was held (March 12) to protest against the judges' interpretations of the law in the case of *El Progreso*, an anti-monarchical paper. In April there were eighteen suits on the file, of which the majority had been commenced under Sagasta's Cabinet; and all were caused by attacks against the King. Of the twenty-six editors who signed the protest, 4 were Sagastistas, 6 of the Dynastic Left, 4 Independent Monarchists, and 12 Republicans; some editors of the Sagasta and Dynastic Left parties refused to sign.

A conspiracy was discovered, resulting in the imprisonment of Zorrilla's secretary (March 17)—the search of whose papers had led to the discovery—as well as of several commissioned and uncommissioned officers in different parts of the country, some generals being among the number. But the greater part of them were liberated by the end of the month, and an attempt (April 28) at insurrection on the frontier by Mangado, an ex-captain, and a few followers, resulted in the leader being killed in an encounter on April 30. About the same time two other conspiracies failed, one in Catalonia, the other at Santa Coloma de Famès (province of Granada). Two officers and some sergeants were captured, and having been tried and condemned, were shot (June 28), notwithstanding the numerous petitions for pardon.

The Cortes having been dissolved (April 1) by Royal decree, the general elections were forthwith held (April 27). The only party that decided to abstain from the polls were the followers of Zorrilla, in accordance with a manifesto issued by their chief. The results of the elections, as usual, showed a very large majority for the Government, and the House of Deputies was composed of 255 Conservatives; 45 Liberal Fusionists, otherwise called Constitutionals (Sagasta's party); 26 Dynastic Left or Liberal Reformistas (Serrano's party); 3 Republican Possibilistas (Castelar's); 4 Independent Republicans; 3 Cuban Autonomists; and 11 Ultramontanes. The whole Opposition, therefore, only numbered 96. This was partly owing to the dissensions which had arisen in the Dynastic Left party; and the breach tended throughout the year to become wider, and the party to become a prey to further schisms. General Serrano, Martos, and Moret, each had his special group or following; and at some of the polls, members of the Left were pitted against each other.

At a meeting of the Conservative deputies, held the eve of the opening of the Cortes, the Premier made a very effective speech, the pith of which was toleration towards all monarchical parties; but no consideration whatever for those that combated the existence of the monarchy. He said he would allow the newspapers

to discuss the Ministers as they pleased, but bade them beware of alluding to the King, and this warning he repeated at a meeting of senators the same evening. The Dynastic Left and Constitutionals, presided over respectively by General Serrano and Señor Sagasta, likewise held meetings in anticipation of the session. By the former it was unanimously decided to maintain the original party programme, aiming at the introduction into the existing Constitution of 1876 of such principles, borrowed from the Constitution of 1869, as would combine democracy with monarchy. By the meeting of the Constitutionals it was resolved to impugn the result of the elections as the outcome of fraud, violence, and coercion. In both meetings, moreover, permanent committees were resolved on for each House to communicate with all the opposition parties.

In opening the Cortes, the King (May 20) laid special stress on the necessity of maintaining order, but to ensure this he declared no fresh laws to be necessary. In the address in answer to the Royal speech, the elections and other political subjects were thoroughly discussed, giving rise to some protracted and stormy sittings. At length it was voted by both Houses, in the Senate (June 11) by 167 against 65, and in the Congress (July 9) by 288 against 64. During these debates, Señor Pidal, Minister of Public Works, made a speech, in which he was reported to have spoken against Italian unity, and in favour of the Pope's temporal power. This was not only generally censured and discussed in the Senate at home, but occasioned a lengthy exchange of messages with the Cabinet and the Quirinal. The issue was that the matter was brought to a close by an assurance on the part of the Spanish Government that the speech had been ill reported, and a Note was drawn up in this sense, and accepted by the Italian Cabinet. No other question of importance was brought forward, and the session was shortly afterwards prorogued (July 26).

It has been previously remarked that in Spain political parties change their names almost as frequently as their leaders decide upon a new programme. The present year offered no exception to this custom, for the Constitutionals or Fusionists, who for some time had been regaining strength by the adherence of Señor Beranger among others, decided, on the suggestion of Señor Sagasta, to assume the high-sounding title of the "Liberal Party." Meanwhile, the Dynastic Left were as far as ever from composing their quarrels, and at a dinner given by some of the party to Moret, his former colleagues Becerra and Lopez Dominguez refused to appear. Moret and his adherents wished to dissolve the Casino, but in this they were opposed by Serrano and his friends, and the only practical outcome of the misunderstanding was that Señor Martos eventually broke off all intercourse with the party. The intimation of General Serrano's intended retirement from active political life was made a fresh occasion for political intrigue. Serrano had expressed his wish to be succeeded in the leadership

of his party by his nephew, General Lopez Dominguez ; but at a meeting of the party, held at Marmolejo (Prov. of Jaen), the proposal, on being mooted, did not meet with general support, nor was the Madrid meeting, held subsequently, more cordial. Despite of this and the active opposition of Moret and his followers, General Lopez Dominguez made a tour through some of the provinces ostensibly but fruitlessly to further the union of the party. Discouraged, however, by his cold reception in the provinces, a grand meeting was convoked and held at Madrid (Dec. 3). Upwards of 2,000 persons were said to have been present, and amongst them were 17 senators and 24 deputies. Without reference to the events of the autumn, Marshal Serrano resumed the chair with little opposition. The establishment of the Constitution of 1869 was insisted on, with universal suffrage, but the demand for constituent chambers was denounced, as well as the acceptance of office by the party without a guarantee that the reforms would be proposed. Moret and Martos, however, with their adherents, continued to stand aloof, and no definite or common programme could be agreed upon among the party leaders. The course of the year was further marked by a curious outburst of sentiments on the part of the Madrid University students. The professor of history, Señor Morayta, having in his opening lecture pronounced himself in favour of freedom of teaching, and expressed doubts as to certain Biblical dates, he was denounced by the Ultramontanes. The Liberal students to the number of 3,000 took his part. The purloins of the University became a scene of tumult, which at last assumed such proportions that a few of the students were arrested. The rector, Señor Pisa Pajares, not having succeeded in maintaining the freedom of the University, of which the Government forbade him to convoke the governing council, tendered his resignation, and Dr. Crens was appointed in his room. Upon this a protest, signed by 94 professors, was transmitted to the Government, and a manifesto issued by the students, who found encouragement not only among the students of the other Spanish Universities; but received sympathetic addresses from those of Rome and Turin. This state of excitement and insubordination was prolonged for several weeks, and it was only towards the close of the year that matters were appeased, and the professors could resume their lectures.

No ceremony marked the reopening of the Cortes (December 27); but Señor Moyano, Senator for the Madrid University, at once brought forward a resolution condemnatory of the Government's action in these events. The reply of the Premier and his colleague of the Colonies was regarded as so unsatisfactory that the Opposition decided to form thereon a vote of censure, the debate on which was postponed until after the commencement of the new year.

At the close of 1883, it will be recollected, disturbances had broken out in the Republic of Andorre, arising out of certain

maintained (all other circles sending only one deputy). By this plan 22 candidates would be secured to the minority; besides which 6 deputies were to be elected, not for any particular circle, but by "accumulation of votes" throughout the realm and adjacent islands, who might or might not be identical with those returned by the minority. The discussion by the Peers on the preliminary measure, authorising the Reform Bill, lasted from the beginning of March to the end of April; but notwithstanding the long and angry speeches made against it, it was voted by 68 against 14, none of the Progressista peers, as agreed beforehand, opposing the Government.

The Budget, as explained by the Finance Minister (February 29), showed a deficit of only 772 *contos* (nearly 175,000*l.*); but there was a large floating debt, which he proposed to consolidate by a loan for 40,000 *contos* nominal (about 4,000,000*l.*), an arrangement which was subsequently ratified by the Cortes. The other fiscal proposals of the Government included a reduction of the duties on salt and spirits; and the abolition of the export duty on bullion; and all these measures became law.

The Army Reform Bill had only passed in the House of Deputies when the Cortes were closed (May 17), but the report of the Committee of the Upper Chamber having been favourable, it was declared to be law by royal decree (June 29). By its principal clauses the army, in time of war, was fixed at 120,000 men, and in time of peace, according to the annual vote of the Cortes. Two classes of reserves were created, of which the second would be liable to be called out only in war-time; and the right to purchase remission from conscription was allowed to continue in force. The action of the Government in thus assuming dictatorial powers was violently attacked by the Opposition press, but the Government organs alleged the urgent necessity for the reform of the army, and showed that a precedent for the act of the Cabinet existed in the decree of April 11, 1865, issued under similar circumstances, by which the entrance of corn and other cereals, subject to a scale of duties, was permanently permitted.

The Chamber of Deputies having been dissolved by decree (May 24), a new Chamber had to be elected under the recent law, especially empowered to decide on constitutional reforms, but limited to the articles detailed in the law just voted.

The addition of a new "party," calling itself *Conservative-Liberal*, with Count de Casal Ribeiro as leader, was perhaps the chief incident of the session. His formal declaration of faith had been made in a sitting of the Peers (April 26), and was followed by a manifesto published in the papers, signed by himself and half-a-dozen other names. The new party apparently hoped, on the occasion of the elections, to increase their strength by adhesions from among the Legitimists, or Miguelites. But disappointment awaited them: for the so-called Legitimists, instead of abstaining from the polls, as was their wont, allied themselves

for the most part with Republicans and Radicals, and so the leaders, *in angustii* for want of followers, could still put their whole party in a nutshell. The elections, as usual, gave the Government an overpowering majority. Of the *Progressistas* 6 were returned by "accumulative votes" (the whole number allowed), 15 by the plurinominal constituencies (minorities), and 10 by the ordinary circles. The Republicans got two candidates returned by the minority vote (both at Lisbon); and the *Constituintes* (now coalesced with the party in power) obtained the remainder of the minority returns, and a few in the ordinary circles.

A decree granting amnesty to all cases against the Press was issued; another, especially relating to a suit filed two years since, against some medical students. Nevertheless, a Republican journalist was subsequently arrested, tried and condemned to fine and a short term of imprisonment (November).

A considerable stir was raised in financial circles by the vote in the General Assembly of shareholders of Portuguese railways, held at Lisbon. The prevailing element on the Board of Directors had always been French, but by this vote the majority passed into Portuguese hands. The ousted party protested on the plea of the illegality of the proceedings. The new directorate in return accused their predecessors of improvidence, extravagance, and even worse. The Portuguese Government was referred to, but decided to leave matters in the hands of the shareholders themselves. A meeting which was summoned, in which the new board were to substantiate their accusations, was suddenly postponed and the ultimate issue was left undecided.

A treaty was concluded at London (February 26), between Portugal and England, whereby the Portuguese sovereignty was recognised on the Western Coast of Africa lying between 8 deg. and 5 deg. 12 min. of south latitude. The country was declared to be open to all nations for commerce and acquisition of land; the Zambesi and Zaire (Congo) Rivers were to be likewise free to commerce and navigation; a mixed Commission of the two nations was to make regulations for the navigation of the Zaire, and limits were fixed as regards the Portuguese rights on the Shirè. This document was laid on the table of the deputies (March 9). In England the matter attracted the attention of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, which petitioned Parliament against the treaty; whilst in Portugal a large part of the Press evinced their dissatisfaction at the result of the negotiations. The treaty also met with a very indifferent reception on the part of several neutral Powers, especially Germany, France, and Holland, whilst the United States, by recognising the flag of the African International Association, had still further complicated matters. These demonstrations deterred the Portuguese Government from promoting the discussion of the treaty in the Cortes; and shortly after the British Government intimated that the ratification of the treaty was useless. The matter was not, however, allowed to drop. Senhor

Antonio de Serpa, late Foreign Minister, was sent during the autumn on a special, or rather a secret, mission to the Courts of London, Hague, Paris, and Berlin, and it speedily transpired that a Conference, initiated by Portugal, would be held at Berlin, composed of the representatives of the nations interested in African affairs. The proposal had, in fact, been accepted by several Powers, and was subsequently adhered to by the others; and on November 15 the Conference was opened, fourteen Powers being represented at the meeting. The points to be discussed, as set forth by Prince Bismarck in the opening session, were threefold, viz.: free trade and navigation for all nations on the Zaire or Congo; the same with regard to the Niger; and the necessity of defining the right of occupying territories in Africa not yet subject to any civilised State. Rights already acquired were not to be discussed. The first two points were settled before Christmas, when the sittings were adjourned till after the holidays. The result, so far as regarded Portugal, was not well received by the public in general, especially on account of the difference in the way of settling the first two points, for, whereas the regulations for the navigation of the Niger were left to the exclusive control of Great Britain, those concerning the Congo, on which Portugal had claims of priority, were to be regulated by an International Commission.

A Council of State was held (October 30) for the purpose of considering the advisability of adjourning the meeting of the Cortes. The Prime Minister, on the plea of the important questions under consideration at the Conference of Berlin, and to avoid the risk of the Government's freedom of action being hampered by interpellations, proposed an adjournment till December 15; and this was seconded by Senhor Serpa. The motion was opposed by Senhor Braamcamp, leader of the Progressistas, supported by two other councillors; but the result was that (there being nine present), six voted for the motion. Senhor Braamcamp declared that the adjournment was tantamount to a rupture of the agreement made with his party, and warned the Government of the serious consequences which would ensue. The Ministry, undaunted by these threats, accepted the decision of the majority, and ultimately the Cortes were opened (December 15) by the King, whose speech was mostly taken up with the three great topics of the day: the Berlin Conference, the Reform Bill as authorised, and sundry projects respecting Africa in view of the issue things had taken in that direction.

Some days elapsed before the new Chamber of Deputies was duly constituted. Meanwhile, a meeting of the Progressistas, presided over by Senhor Braamcamp, had taken place, wherein it was formally declared that the party withdrew from the agreement made with the Cabinet respecting the Reform Bill—this principally on the score of the dictatorial procedure of Government in the interim; and an uncompromising opposition was resolved upon.

VI. DENMARK.

There was little improvement in the political outlook in Denmark, at the beginning of the year, and at its close the prospect showed but little sign of change. Legislative work was practically at a standstill, so long as the Liberal party refused to pass any measures proposed by the Estrup Ministry. The only change in the tactics of the Liberal majority in the Folkething was to relegate at once all new Government Bills on their first reading to committees, with the express purpose of shelving them, instead of, as formerly, to allow the Bills to pass a second reading before they were sent to their respective committees.

An exception was, however, made in the case of the Government Bill for Improving the National Defences, which, having been read a first time (January 18) was referred to a special committee, which lost no time in reporting it back (March 28) to the Folkething, but the Liberal majority in the Lower House, acting upon the recommendation of the committee, threw out the Bill (April 2), and refused to let it be read a second time. The chief debates of the session, however, centred round the Budget, which, after being in the hands of the Budget Committee for three months, was reported back (January 22) to the Folkething. The committee had considerably reduced the expenditure, and on the second reading the majority of the Lower House supported the report of the committee; and it was only just prior to the close of the financial year that the Budget, in its mutilated state, was sent up (March 8) to the Landsting. It was read there for the first time (March 15) and referred to a committee, but there seemed to be little possibility of the Budget passing before the end of the financial year. Government, therefore, brought in (March 18) a "temporary" Budget. The Budget Committee of the Landsting, however, had hastened its work, both upon the ordinary and the "temporary" Budget (March 27); the adoption of the former was recommended as it had come up from the Lower House, but entering a strong protest against any future attempt to pass "temporary" Budgets, and thereby assisting in the dangerous practice of delaying the passing of the Budget beyond the time fixed by the Constitution. The Government accepted, reluctantly, the amended Budget, which was then passed by the Upper House. The Budget of 1884-85, as proposed by the Government, showed a revenue of 53,500,000 kroner (about 3,000,000*l.* sterling), and an expenditure of 51,500,000 kroner; but the Folkething, following the precedents of recent years, had reduced the expenditure by about 5,500,000 kroner, and increased the revenue by about 120,000 kroner.

The House might then have adjourned, but for a commercial

treaty with Spain, which was signed in Copenhagen (March 29), and immediately afterwards laid before the Rigsdag to be ratified before the close of its sittings. The Folkething would not, however, allow this question to be settled without a protest, and suddenly decided to resume in connection with the Spanish treaty the discussion of a Bill for the revision of customs, which had been shelved by a committee. During two entire months the matter was bandied to and fro between the two Houses, and at length the session closed (May 31) without any agreement having been arrived at with regard to the treaty. With the exception of a Bill for the erection of a State Lunatic Asylum, which the Conservative press of the country suggested would especially benefit the supporters of the Liberal party, no other work had been got through during the session, which had lasted eight months. Of the sixty-two Government Bills, of which eight first passed the Upper House, forty-six were relegated to committees, whence they never emerged.

During the summer, the usual political meetings were held all over the country in view of the coming elections for the Folkething. These took place on June 25, and the returns showed a further increase in the Liberal majority of the Lower House, where there now are 82 Liberals against 20 Conservatives, and of the latter only 17 declared themselves as thoroughgoing supporters of the Ministry. The Conservatives, moreover, received a heavy blow by the election of 3 Liberals in Copenhagen. The capital had for years been considered as the stronghold of Danish Conservatism; but the Liberals had in the previous year announced their intention of "conquering" Copenhagen. The immediate cause of the Liberal victory in the capital was due to the co-operation of the Social Democrats, with the manifest design of overthrowing, if possible, the Estrup Ministry. In Aarhus, a very large provincial town, a Socialist was also elected. This is the first time that Social Democrats are represented in the Danish Rigsdag.

The Rigsdag, having formally assembled (August 14) for a couple of days to ratify the elections, adjourned until October, but in consequence of the destruction by fire of the Kristiansborg Castle (October 3), where the Rigsdag held its meetings, the opening ceremony was performed in the hall of the University. In his speech from the throne the King referred to the loss of Kristiansborg Castle, and entreated the Rigsdag to secure the independence of the country by passing the necessary measures for its defence, expressing the hope that the other efforts made for the welfare of the country would then be crowned with success.

Temporary quarters for the two Houses were found in the large barracks in Fredericia Street. The Budget was at once laid before the Rigsdag, and having passed the first stage in the Folkething (November 12), was referred to the Budget Committee, which had not concluded its labours before the end of the year. Meanwhile,

there was no evidence of a more harmonious understanding between the two Houses. On the contrary, in the Lower House a motion was made, and carried (November 19) by a majority of sixty-three against eighteen, that "the Folkething, after the elections of June 25, must with increased strength maintain that all discussion of reforms with the present Government is a waste of time, and that the House passes to the orders of the day." This resolution became a party watchword on every occasion when Government Bills were presented, and this tactic of throwing out Ministerial measures was frequently resorted to during the remainder of the season, before the Houses adjourned for the Christmas holidays.

The Landsting had in the meantime been seriously at work on several important Bills that had been laid before it. A Bill for the improvement of the national defences, referred to a committee, showed very considerable concessions when compared with the Bills hitherto presented by the Government, especially with regard to the plan for the fortifications.

Last year reference was made to a rupture between Mr. Berg, the leader of the Liberal party, and Messrs. Brandes and Hörup, both prominent members of the so-called "Literary Left" (*see* A. R. 1883, p. 285), and also members of the Folkething. These latter retired from the editorship of the *Morgenbladet*, the leading organ of the Liberal party, at the beginning of the year, but in the autumn they started their own paper, the *Politiken*, which became now the leading organ of the advanced Liberals and of the "Literary Left." A further rupture between these parties seemed, much to the delight of the Conservatives, at one moment imminent; but in spite of some angry articles on both sides, the breach never assumed proportions dangerous to the Liberal cause, for both parties were virtually agreed upon the reforms before the Rigsdag, and upon the necessity of displacing the Estrup Ministry. Their differences may, no doubt, be attributed to a struggle for the future leadership of the Liberal party. Mr. Berg, the present acknowledged leader and the president of the Folkething, succeeded, however, in the course of the autumn in strengthening his position by welding together the more moderate of the Liberals in the Lower House into a group, now called the "Danish Left," numbering about forty-eight of the members of the Folkething, whilst Messrs. Hörup and Brandes could count twenty-four supporters in the same House.

The population of Schleswig-Holstein was again, during the year, subject to much persecution from the Prussian authorities. During the summer two pleasure excursions, one consisting of 2,000 Schleswigians and one of 300 girls from the South Jutland provinces, now in the possession of the Germans, visited their friends in North and West Jutland. No political demonstration was intended, but in consequence of these harmless visits to friends and relations, a great number of peaceable citizens were forthwith

expelled from their native country; and not only people who actually took part in the excursion, but others, who by ties of relationship or even of business were connected with the excursionists, were also forced to quit their homes. The German authorities also proceeded against sixteen young ladies in Aabenraa, who one day had sung Danish songs to the accompaniment of a piano in a private house. In the Court of First Instance the young ladies were sentenced to fines, but on appealing to the Upper Court they were acquitted. A bookseller in Haderslev is also being prosecuted for exhibiting in his window Danish books, which were published in parts, and had the Danish flag or the Danish national colours on the cover.

VII. NORWAY.

When the Rigsret, or the Supreme Court of the Realm (*see ANNUAL REGISTER*, 1883, pp. 290-92), adjourned for the Christmas holidays in December 1883, the counsel for Mr. Selmer, the impeached Prime Minister, had only replied to the first article of the impeachment. On the resumption of the sittings (Jan. 10), Mr. Heffermehl, the second counsel for Mr. Selmer, replied to the second article of the impeachment, and was followed by Mr. Heyerdahl, who dealt with the third article. The leading counsel then summed up for the defence, maintaining that the charges brought against the Prime Minister had not been proved, and that he in consequence should be acquitted. Mr. Blehr, in reply, dealt exclusively with the pleas urged against the first article of the impeachment; and after him, Mr. Walter Scott Dahl, the leading counsel for the prosecution, proceeded to reply on the second and third articles. When the counsel for the Prime Minister had replied and concluded their final defence (February 18), the Prime Minister himself addressed the Supreme Court in a short speech, in which he pleaded that the advice he had given the King on the questions at issue was given in the full conviction that he was acting for the welfare of the country. Pending the judgment the excitement all over the country was great. The Ministerial party expressed the fear of disturbance by the populace, in case the Ministry should be acquitted, and it afterwards transpired that the authorities had thought it necessary to take precautions. After five days' deliberation, judgment was delivered (February 27) in the presence of the accused Prime Minister. He was found guilty of high misdemeanour on the charge of having advised the King to veto, first, the resolution of the Storthing of March 17, 1880, admitting ministers to seats in the National Assembly; second, a Bill involving a question of supply—a grant of money to volunteer corps established in various parts of the country; and third, a Bill enabling the Storthing to appoint two additional members on the committee of directors for the Government railways. The Court sentenced him to be discharged from his office of Minister of State and to pay the fees of the prosecuting counsel (in all about 1,000*l.*), the State paying the other expenses connected with the prosecution.

The Liberal party and press all over the country expressed themselves satisfied with the judgment, although some of the advanced Liberals regretted that the judgment did not go to the extent of declaring the Prime Minister unworthy to fill any office under the Crown in future, and of ordering him to pay all costs, as demanded by the counsel for the prosecution.

In the following month, the cases of the remaining ten ministers came successively before the Supreme Court. Little or no time was lost in pleadings in these cases, that of the Prime Minister being taken as a precedent. The judgment delivered against Mr. Kjerulf (March 17) was in substance the same as that against his chief, Mr. Selmer, with the exception that his share in the fees to the counsels for the prosecution was reduced to a mere trifle. Messrs. Vogt, Holmboe, Helliesen, Jensen, and Munthe received in succession the same judgment, having all been found guilty in all the three articles of the impeachment. Mr. Bachke, however, was only found guilty in articles 1 and 3, but received the same sentence. The remaining three ministers, Messrs. Johansen, Schweigaard, and Hertzberg, were only fined 8,000 kroner each (about 450*l.*), neither of them having been impeached on the first charge of having advised the King to veto the Bill for the admittance of the ministers to the Storting. Mr. Johansen had even advised the sanction of this Bill, whilst Messrs. Schweigaard and Hertzberg had entered the Ministry after the royal assent had been refused. The various judgments were ordered to be successively laid by a deputation of eight members of the Supreme Court before the King, if in the Norwegian capital, and if not, then before the Government.

The excitement in the country, already considerable before the verdict had been given, rose to feverish anxiety, in expectation of what the King would do. The Conservative organs of the country openly advised the King to disregard the judgment of the Supreme Court, and party feeling everywhere ran high. Rumours of all kinds were afloat, and it was generally believed that the King would attempt a *coup d'état*. Many of the Conservative party in Sweden also encouraged the King to set the judgment of the Supreme Court aside, and it was even hinted that he might depend upon the Swedish army to assist him in carrying out his policy in Norway. Fortunately for himself and for his dynasty in Norway, the King did not follow this dangerous advice, and, after some hesitation, he issued (March 11) an order in Council announcing that the judgment of the Supreme Court would be carried into effect, and Mr. Selmer was called upon to resign his post as Minister of State. The King, however, in his declaration, upheld the constitutional prerogatives of the Crown, which he maintained were not impaired by the judgment of the Rigsret, and at the same time he sharply censured the judgment of the Court against his late Prime Minister. On the same day the King conveyed to Mr. Selmer his acknowledgment of his past services,

and created him a Knight of the Order of the Seraphim, the highest of Swedish Orders.

The Conservatives were much disappointed by the King's course of action, but they endeavoured to console themselves by strongly forcing upon him the urgent necessity of appointing a new Conservative Ministry, which would carry on the policy of the late Cabinet, and uphold the privileges of the Crown. Mr. Bachke, one of the ex-ministers, who had escaped with a fine, was temporarily appointed Prime Minister, while some deputy-ministers, quite unknown in the political world, were appointed to the other portfolios. A little later (April 3) a new Conservative Ministry was appointed by the King, with Mr. Schweigaard (also one of the late Ministers) as its chief; with Mr. Lövenskjold, Minister of State, in attendance upon the King at Stockholm; Messrs. Bang, Dahll, Koren, Aubert, Hertzberg, Reimers, and Lehmann were nominated Councillors of State. Most of these were men without political reputation or ability, and even the Conservatives felt that this *Ministère de combat*, so composed, could not long remain in office. Had they decided to advise the King to resist further, they would simply have been impeached before a new Rigsret, and no real step towards the solution of the difficulty would have been made. It was therefore not surprising that signs of discouragement and disunion prevailed. The position was, moreover, aggravated when rumours reached the Storting that shortly before the verdict of the Rigsret had been delivered, the locks of a great number of rifles stored in several dépôts near Christiania had been removed and secreted, and that warlike preparations had been made at the Akershus Fort. The new Minister of War, Mr. Dahll, when questioned by the Storting, admitted that his predecessor, Mr. Munthe, on his own responsibility, had given orders to unscrew the locks of the rifles belonging to several regiments, and that the ammunition had been removed from the stores to the fort at Christiania, "that they might be out of the way of the people in case of a rising." Mr. Munthe himself was confined to his bed, and could not be personally interrogated before the Storting. These discoveries rendered the position of the new Ministry day by day more precarious, and the King no doubt saw that a continued struggle with the people would be hopeless. He therefore hastened his arrival at the Norwegian capital, and had several communications with the leaders of the Liberal party as to a possible compromise, and the appointment of a new Ministry, that would prove acceptable to the Liberal majority of the Norwegian Storting, and ultimately Professor Broch, formerly a member of the King's Council, was deputed to form a Ministry. Professor Broch was known to hold sound Liberal views; and although he did not in all points agree with the majority in the Storting, a Ministry under his leadership would no doubt have been accepted by the Liberals. But, after having for some time attempted to fill the various posts with

men acceptable both to the King and the majority of the Storting, he informed the King that he was unable to form an administration, and considered his mission at an end. Mr. Richter, who was next entrusted with the task, was equally unsuccessful. There was now nothing left for the King to do but to request Mr. Johan Sverdrup, the leader of the Liberal party, and the President of the Storting, to take office; and with little delay a Liberal Cabinet was constituted as follows: Mr. Johan Sverdrup, Prime Minister; Mr. Ole Richter, Minister of State, in attendance upon the King in Stockholm; Mr. Ludvig Daae, Department of War; Mr. A. Sörensen, Department of Justice; Mr. B. Haugland, Department of Finance; Mr. S. Arctander, Department of Education and Church; Mr. B. Kildal, Department of Audit; while Mr. Assessor Stang and Pastor Jacob Sverdrup, were appointed Councillors of State, to reside at Stockholm. (The Norwegian Government, it may be observed, consists of two Ministers of State, and eight Councillors of State, of whom one Minister and two Councillors of State reside at Stockholm, to be near the King.) The country hailed the new Ministry with enthusiasm. All its members enjoyed the confidence of the Liberal party, and they were all tried and experienced politicians, who had earned their spurs in the vanguard of the Liberals in the National Assembly.

The King's first act was to sanction in Council of State (July 1) the Bill for the admission of ministers to seats in the Storting, and this was followed by the Royal assent to the other points at issue. When the members of the new Ministry took for the first time (July 2) their seats in the National Assembly, the new President, Mr. Rector Steen, in a speech, welcomed the new Ministry, and the realisation of the wish so long entertained by the people of the country. To this, Mr. Sverdrup replied in suitable words, expressing the desire of the new Ministry to work in harmony with the representatives of the people, and his gratification that at the end of a long struggle, extending over ten years, the principle of ministerial responsibility had been at length recognised.

Shortly afterwards the Storting was prorogued (July 7). No important legislative measure had been inaugurated or passed during the session, the attention of the Storting having been occupied with the proceedings of the Rigsret. After the formation of the new Ministry the Storting again passed the Bill for the admission of Ministers to the Assembly, with a slight amendment, proposed by Bishop Livius Smith, to the effect that ex-Ministers, unlike ordinary members, might be elected for any town or district, whether resident in it or not. Peace having now been established between the executive and the legislative bodies of the State, the Storting granted the increase in the appanage of the Crown Prince, which it had refused three times before. The Budget showed a revenue of 42,385,841 kroner (2,354,770*l.*), and an expenditure of 41,345,841 kroner (2,297,000*l.*)

A Bill for the extension of the Franchise was also passed a

two days before the prorogation of the Storthing. The new Ministry accepted the principles of the Bill, it being in fact identical with that introduced by Mr. Sverdrup in 1881, when it had been passed by the Storthing, but was refused Royal sanction. By the Bill about 40,000 new electors were created, the franchise being extended to everyone paying taxes upon a yearly income of at least 500 kroner (28*l.*) in the country and of 800 kroner (45*l.*) in the towns, coupled with one year's residence in his constituency (borough), and who, "as a servant, did not belong to another household."

VIII. SWEDEN.

While Norway thus was passing through an important political crisis, the sister country could congratulate herself upon a year of peaceful politics. Attempts, no doubt, were made by a certain fraction of the Conservatives in Sweden to mix their country in the constitutional struggle going on in Norway; but the friendly feeling between the two countries was so firmly established, and the sympathy of the Swedish people at large and among the Liberal majority in the Second Chamber of the Riksdag so pronounced that, happily for both nationalities, no Swedish interference took place.

The Riksdag opened at the usual time. The speech from the throne contained nothing of importance beyond pointing out that only the most necessary grants for the defences of the country would be asked for, since public opinion was so divided at the present time with regard to the reorganisation of the army. Great curiosity was manifested as to what attitude the Second Chamber would take up towards the new Ministry. Most of its members had belonged to Count Posse's Ministry, but its character had completely changed after Count Posse's resignation. He had taken office as the representative of the influential Landtmanna party and fell, through not being able to carry out a programme which this party was supposed to have accepted. The support, therefore, of a Ministry, so modified as it had been, could scarcely be counted upon; but in the course of the session nothing of importance happened to show that legislative hostility was intended. The Riksdag certainly refused to grant the greater part of the grants for the improvement of the land defences, asked for by the Government; but it was scarcely wise, after the lessons of the previous session to propose partial reforms to the extent suggested in the Government Bill. Means were, however, granted for the strengthening of the navy.

The Riksdag passed several useful measures, such as a new Patent Law, a new act for the protection of Trade Marks, and a law altering the coming of age of women from 25 to 21 years, thus placing them on an equal footing with the men.

The state of the revenue was satisfactory. Considerable sums were applied to renewing the material of the State railways, as well as to creating a fund for the erection of a new Parliament

House. The Budget showed a surplus of 1,866,820 kroner, or about 103,700*l*.

Shortly after the prorogation of the Riksdag a slight change took place in the Ministry; the Prime Minister, Mr. Thyselius, resigned, and the King advanced Mr. Themptander, the Minister of Finance, to the Premiership, whilst Count Gustaf Tamm succeeded Mr. Themptander.

The Liberal majority in the Second Chamber, as shown by the elections this year, gave evidence of a steady advance of political opinion, and it was especially noteworthy that Stockholm, which hitherto had returned a solid phalanx of nineteen Conservatives, this year elected only Liberals. The validity of the Stockholm election was, however, questioned, and a new election was ordered to take place early in the new year, but the impression prevailed that the Liberals would again carry the day.

The question of the two State theatres came before the Riksdag again this year. The Riksdag expressed its willingness to grant 60,000 kroner for three years, and a subvention of 15,000 kroner a year, if the local authorities of Stockholm would contribute 50,000 kroner a year, but the Town Council unhesitatingly refused all assistance, and the theatres would have been closed and probably sold, had not a private subscription been set on foot, whereby the theatres were saved for at least another three years.

CHAPTER V.

ASIA.

AFGHANISTHÁN—CENTRAL ASIA—INDIA—CHINA—JAPAN AND COREA.

A. AFGHANISTHÁN.

IN accordance with previous practice, the record of the events of the year 1884 will begin with those of Kábul and its neighbours. The interest of these centres rather in the relations of the Amir with the more remote portions of his territory than in the internal administration and domestic history of Afghanisthán. In one important respect the year was fortunate, and that is in the apparent reconciliation, at least for the time being, of the Durrani tribes of the south and south-west and the present Amir. There was not, moreover, any general movement on the part of the Ghilzais or other leading tribes against Abdul Rahman or his lieutenants. The chief friction between the ruling authority and those residing within his dominions was found, as last year, amongst the tribes on the east and north of Kábul. The Shinwáris, although not in open rebellion, as in 1883, showed but slight recognition of the Amir's authority, or of the obligations they undertook at the end

of the campaign of the summer. Parwānah Khān, the chief Minister, was sent to visit their country, amongst others, in the same direction, and endeavour to bring them into subjection; but within a few months of his visit they attempted to plunder the caravan conveying to Kābul a portion of the Amir's subsidy from India, and were only beaten off by an escort of unusual strength. But the active disturbances in the direction of the Sufed Koh and Kurraín were not amongst the Shinwāris, but amongst some tribes of the Mangals, headed by one Sadu Khān, a noted freebooter. It appears that Muhammad Hasan Khān, ex-governor of Jelālabād, whose intrigues were the cause of the Shinwāri outbreak last year, fled, on the destruction of the Shinwāri stronghold, to Tirah, and failing to procure assistance from the Ghilzais or Afridis, had recourse to the Mangals, in communication, it was reported, with Ayub Khān's emissaries in North Kābul. The disturbances spread until the Amir was forced to send his most experienced general, Gholam Haidar, leaving in Kunar, where Parwānah Khān had been unsuccessful in collecting the revenue, General Muhammad Amir Khān, with a Kizilbash as governor. Part of the garrison of Jelālabād was detached for duty at Gurjan, at the foot of the Sufed Koh, against the Mandezai Shinwāris, and replaced by a regiment from Kandahar. General Gholām Haidar then advanced into the Mangal territory (Khost), where some troops had been already sent, which, however, were stopped by the excessive snow on the Shutargardan Pass. Sadu Khān, after a raid or two on the camel train of the force, gave battle, and, like the Shinwāri chiefs, on his defeat left his band, and fled to the Urokzais of Tirah, who, along with the Turis, it is said, and Waziris, had openly declared in his favour. It is doubtful how far, considering the known politics of this region, this report was true, since the Waziris are subsidised by the British Government, and have never acknowledged the dominion of Kābul; but it is certain that Sadu left his followers and fled. The Mangal villages were burnt, and a deputation (Jirgah) allowed to go to the Amir at Kābul. The latter demanded the surrender, not only of Sadu, but of Muhammad Hasan and Faiz Muhammad, who had taken refuge in the Khost valley. The head men refused to accede to these demands, and returned to their mountains. Subsequently, however, they came to terms. Pir Dost, the leader of the local tribes which had given most trouble, came to Kābul, and, after some delay, the rest of the tribes submitted, and paid revenue through General Gholām Haidar. Some of the troops thus set free were transferred to the Herāt and Kandahar frontier—a fact which seemed to show the Amir's belief in the rumour that Muhammad Hasan had fled in disguise to Mecca through Sind or Bombay. There was evidence, nevertheless, of ill feeling along the Kābul and Kunar valleys for long after the cessation of actual field operations. Twice in the year was the governor of Jelālabād disturbed in the tenure of his office. The Kunar people began to

emigrate rather than submit to the taxation of their land by the Amir. The Khán of Lálpura, on being summoned by the Amir to Kábul, left his head-quarters, and took shelter in a more remote part of the Mohmand country, appealing, meanwhile, to the good offices of the British officials of the Khaibar. As this chief had on several occasions done notable service in protecting the traffic through the Pass, the officer in command at Landi Kotal undertook the necessary negotiations, but with what result was not reported by the end of the year. It is probable that the stringent measures taken by the Amir in Kábul against some leading men who were charged with aiding officials to embezzle the revenue had some connection with Akbar Khán's distrust, as treasure was suspected of having been sent from Kábul, through Dáka and Lálpura, to Peshawar. It is certain that for some portion of the year trade between Peshawar and Kábul was nearly at a standstill, owing to the distrust prevailing as to the safety of property in Kábul. The Mustafi of that city was arrested, amongst other personages, as an accomplice of Mir Ahmad, Administrator of Excise, a branch of the revenue which had been increased during the year by the Amir's order. It was also rumoured that payment of taxes had been demanded in advance of its fixed date, all of which tended to obstruct the free circulation of trade in the capital and the towns within easy range of the court officials.

Ayub Khán.—The most serious military expedition of the year was that undertaken by the Amir's kinsman, Muhammad Ishák Khán, governor of Turkesthán, against Mir Diláwar Khán, Wali of Maimanah. There were no doubts as to the sympathy of Mir Diláwar for the family of Shere Ali, and the presence of Ayub Khán at Mashad brought matters to a crisis. A letter was intercepted by Muhammad Ishák Khán to Abdu'Salám, Kázi of Afghanisthán under Shere Ali, in which Ayub stated his intention of leaving Mashad for Maimanah, where he had the support promised him of the Wali, in addition to that of the Firozkohi and Hazára tribes. A letter was also found from Muhammad Hasan, who has been mentioned above in connection with the Shinwári and Mangal troubles, in which he gave instructions to local officials in Turkesthán regarding Ayub's arrival and their co-operation. On the discovery of these intrigues, the Sháh (who had previously, with the approval of the British Government, given his consent to Ayub's departure from Teheran *viâ* Mashad to Bokhára, where he was to reside) revoked his permission, and on the agreement of the Indian Government to provide 8,000*l.* a year for the maintenance of Ayub Khán and a suitable retinue, interned that energetic chief in Teheran. It was at first requested by Ayub that the place of his confinement should be Mashad, or some other place in Khorasan; but having due regard to what had taken place in Maimanah, and what will be related below regarding movements still nearer Persia, the Sháh refused his sanction to this choice of residence. Some of the followers of Ayub Khán returned to

Herat, where they made their submission to Názir Muhammad Sarwan Khán, who had succeeded Kunduz Khán as governor of that province. In Maimanah the population seemed strongly opposed to the present Amir, and though no trustworthy details of the expedition are forthcoming, there seems reason to believe that reverses were suffered by the Amir's general in the first instance. Reinforcements were awaited, and meanwhile Nazir Muhammad Sarwan marched a force into the country from the Herat direction, and co-operating with Muhammad Ishák, completely overran it. Mir Diláwar, the recalcitrant Wali, was captured and deported to Kábul, and it was reported that Mir Hussain Khán, the former Wali, was reinstated. To emphasise this victory, Muhammad Ishák was ordered by the Amir to summon all the Turkesthán chiefs to gather at Balkh, where they were also to be subsidised for active service. Nazir Muhammad returned to Herat, where the garrison under General Faramorz Khán was reinforced from Jelálábád, and the treasury replenished from Kábul. These precautions were necessitated partly on account of the withdrawal of some of the Persian outposts along the eastern bank of the Hari Rud, north of Herat, partly by the raids of Turkomans from the Murgháb district. The garrison in Panjdeh, which partly commands the latter, was also reinforced,¹ and as a popular and conciliatory measure, the Amir appointed as governor of this important outpost, Azimullah Khán, son of Khán Agha, leader of the powerful Jámshidi tribe. In addition to these movements of troops and provision of money and supplies of war, other indications during the year were manifest of a state of preparation for hostilities on the part of the Amir. A small-arms factory was set up at Jelálábád; the Kábul arsenal was enlarged, and given full employment. Caravans of small-arms ammunition and iron for casting cannon balls were passed both through the Khaibar and Bolán. Forces, more or less numerous, were in the field during a great part of the year, both in Maimanah, Khost, and Shignán, where they found an active enemy, and in Farrah, Herat, and Kuner, where they were in observation only. The relations between the Amir and the British Government were as friendly as last year, the only appearance of friction being in connection with the Lálpura affair and the attempted encroachment of Afghan outposts within the limits of the West Khaibar, where it is under British protection. When active co-operation was asked for in the autumn, on the passage of a British Commission and escort through Western Afghanisthán, the Amir responded in a cordial and practical spirit, which left nothing to be desired.

Central Asia.—This was on the occasion of the deputation of a Commission by England to meet one similarly proposed by Russia for the settlement of the frontier line between Afghanisthán and

¹ It was afterwards stated that troops were sent on this occasion for the first time to Panjdeh by the Amir, but this fact was left for investigation by the Delimitation Commission.

the Turkoman territory on the north and north-west of the Amir's dominions. This Commission originated in the occupation of Merv by the Russians, early in the year, and in the continuous pushing forward of the Cossack outposts towards Herat and the south. It will be recollected that for the last two years mention has been made in this record of the survey operations undertaken by M. Lessar and other Russian officials along the Tajend and Akkal region to the Hari Rud valley, as far as Sarakhs. This year it was found that by a secret treaty Persia had ceded Sarakhs to Russia, whilst the Persian outposts had been withdrawn from a great portion of the eastern bank of the Hari Rud, as if to facilitate the Russian advance southwards, but keeping possession of the low passes between Sarakhs and Herat. It appears, however, from reports from Herat, that the Amir had these eastern outposts through Badghiz reinforced at once by his own men from Panjdeh. A further complication was suggested by the fact that Russia put forward a claim to jurisdiction over all Muhammadans of the Sunni persuasion along the Persian frontier, and the governor of Askabád installed a chief of the Alieli tribe as their delegate in these functions. The Sunnis stretch along the frontier far to the south of Herat, so that such a claim could not be admitted by the Amir. In another direction was the Russian claim to Shignán, and the contiguous and equally disputed territory of Wakhán, both held by the Amir to form an integral portion of Afghanistan. But more directly menacing than either of those was the advance southwards from Merv to Pul-i-Khatun and towards Panjdeh. In the latter place a Russian surveyor was caught in April, and said to have been sent to Sarakhs by the Afghan governor. There is no doubt that Afghan places north of Panjdeh were temporarily occupied by Cossacks, who were seen there by British officers, one of whom, the well-known Colonel Stewart, was on the Khorasan frontier for the first half of the year. Lastly came the report that the Russians had demanded from the Amir of Bokhara the cession of Shirabád, which is the only large post between Samarkand and Balkh, whilst Russian surveyors had been found at work in Yásin and Chitrál, progressing towards Kashmir by way of Gilgit. Merv itself was occupied early in March. According to the Turkoman account, Major Alikhanow (a Russianised Muhammadan of Dághesthán, by name 'Ali Khán), with a few troops of Akkal horsemen, came to Merv on March 6, and requested the Turkoman elders to come and confer with the Russian authorities at Askabád. They seem to have done so, and returned almost immediately with a Russian force at their heels. The latter encamped a few miles from the town. An anti-Russian party in Merv counselled resistance, but was only feebly supported, and, after a plucky demonstration, was broken up, and its leader, Kajjar Khán, afterwards captured and deported. Meanwhile, Alikhanow entered Merv, and in a very short time sent his outposts to Pul-i-Khisti, fifteen miles north-west of Panjdeh. Merv was visited by Prince

Dondukow Korsakow, the well-known governor-general of the Caucasus province, who arranged for the administration of the Merv district, and the fortification of the city. He also had steps taken to prepare two roads, one to the Oxus, the other towards Herat. The 400 Turkomans captured on the first occupation of Merv were released, but apparently enrolled in the irregular local cavalry. The Saryk Turkomans also submitted, and were placed under the governor of Yulatán, on the Murgháb, who was, like Alikhanow, a Muhammadan of Dághesthán. The latter was left at Merv in full power, where he was still at the end of the year. It is worthy of note that directly after Merv was occupied and Sarakhs ceded, additions were made to the governor-general's staff in Turkesthán of men specially known for their intimate acquaintance with Afghanisthán, and on the re-organisation of the Trans-Caspian Government in December 1884, a "Diplomatic Agent," M. Lessar, the explorer, an ardent advocate of the "forward" or "ethnological" policy of Russia, was added to the staff, to conduct all foreign affairs with Persia, Afghanisthán, and the still independent Turkomans. This agent was to have authority next to the governor-general, whilst the military forces were to be more concentrated in the large stations. It may be mentioned, also, that during the year the Persian provinces of Adarbezán and Ghilán, bordering on the south-west of the Caspian, were in a disturbed state, owing to the preaching of some pretended "Mahdis," or fanatical Mullahs, who were stirring up the Muhammadans against the Russians. Amongst the Kurds this had some effect, for complaints are recorded in the Russian organ at Tiflis that the insurgents received plentiful supplies of Peabody rifles and small-arms ammunition from Persian agents and manufacturers.

The withdrawal of General Tchernaiëw, almost immediately after his communication to the Emperor of a plan for the future invasion of India, gave great offence to the local commandants of the advanced school of politics, amongst whom he was a recognised leader, especially as his successor, Rosenbach, was by repute a man of more moderate views. It was asserted that the occupation of Merv was a practical rejoinder by the local governor, intended to show the St. Petersburg Cabinet the irresistible pressure of circumstances which impel Russia to a rapid absorption of Central Asia, as the organ of Prince Dondukow represented it as undertaken in response to the spontaneous request of a majority of the inhabitants.

The Afghan Frontier Commission.—The outcome of this act was the appointment of a joint Anglo-Russian Commission proposed by Russia and accepted by England, of a mixed military, diplomatic, and scientific character, which was to demarcate the frontier line of Afghanisthán on the north. The Commission was moved for in Parliament in May, and the English representative, General Sir Peter Lumsden (a member of the Council of India), was nominated in the autumn. This officer had had some experience in the country concerned in 1857, and, as the Commission

was initiated in England, as an imperial undertaking, rather than in India, it was considered more politic to avoid selecting as the leader any one still directly connected with the military or diplomatic affairs of the latter country. It was arranged for the English Commissioner to start from Teheran, where an *attaché* from the English embassy, well versed in frontier politics, was to join him. He was to be assisted by the Junior Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department, Lieutenant-Colonel Ridgeway, with two *attachés*, and by Colonel Stewart, a political explorer of the country in dispute. India also furnished an escort of native cavalry and infantry. The Amir was not invited to nominate a representative on equal terms with the two Empires, but was invited to send a special envoy to watch proceedings on his behalf, and to act generally with the British officials. He declined to hold himself responsible for the good conduct of the western tribes, who would probably be incited by fanatics to attack a slender escort, and strongly advised the Indian party to keep clear of Afghán territory in that direction. His advice was taken, and on the route every facility for supplies and transport was given by him.

It was arranged in India that the escort should consist of 400 cavalry and 400 infantry, who were to rendezvous at Quetta. In addition to the diplomatic staff, there were two experienced survey officers, under the orders of Major Holditch, who had completed the survey of the difficult Sulaimán country in the latter part of 1883. A medical officer and a geologist, with four Muhammadan officers of rank, some of whom were connected with distinguished Afghan families, completed the *personnel* of Colonel Ridgeway's party. An advance survey was made from Quetta of the semi-desert country between the Bolán hills and the frontier at Nashki, continued across the desert to Khwajeh 'Ali on the Helmand, and the political officer for this portion of Baluchisthán went in advance of the expedition to provide for the supplies and camels. The main body left Quetta on September 13, and the survey officers utilised their leisure during the passage of the escort in mapping out the hitherto scarcely known route, and in preparing a line for a light surface railway as far as the Helmand, in case the necessity should arise for such an aid in sending troops towards Herát in future. The Baluch and Brahui Sirdárs of the neighbourhood of Rindli and the desert were found friendly, and sent in a stock of camels sufficient for the whole party as far as Sarakhs, if required. The first part of the journey was highly successful, and the whole expedition crossed "en echelon" of three parties, in order to allow the wells to refill between each watering. They met again at Khwajah 'Ali on the Helmand, where an envoy from the Amir met them, and accompanied Colonel Ridgeway along the skirts of the western districts, in order to avoid the large towns, which were more under the influence of fanatical Mullahs, who might excite at any moment some violence against the strangers.

Communication was first established between the English and the Indian sections of the Commission from Ibrahimábád, and Sir P. Lumsden entered Panjdeh early in December, whilst Colonel Ridgeway, having taken the route by Kushk, had met his chief at Kuhsan on November 28. On December 13 the party reached Bála Murgháb, where they were expected to winter. No active operations were undertaken before Christmas, partly owing to the absence of the Russian Commissioner, General Zelenoi, whose delay was due to diplomatic transactions conducted by M. Lessar in London. Under these circumstances, the winter was spent by Sir P. Lumsden and his colleagues in studying the situation, making observations of the country, and utilising the records of Colonel Stewart's long experience of these regions; whilst the Russians, on their side, pushed forward the fortifications of Merv and built new ones at Pul-i-Khatun, which, with Sarakhs and the lands to the east thereof, completely cover alternative routes to Herát.

B. INDIAN FRONTIERS.

North-east.—The expedition against the Akka tribes in North Assam, which was undertaken at the end of last year, was pushed forward in January. An attempted surprise of the chief's principal village failed, owing to the superior information obtained by the enemy. On January 8, however, Brigadier-General Hill, having obtained reinforcements and a few mountain guns, drove back the enemy after a stubborn resistance, in which poisoned arrows played a leading part, and on one occasion actually kept the troops from crossing a difficult ford on the river. The advance to Buragaon was then easy, as the Akkas, having vindicated their character, and being deterred by the fire of the guns, thought of no more resistance. The prisoners taken from the foresters' station, whose rescue was the original object of the expedition, were restored, and the chiefs and head men made a nominal submission. Later in the year the disputes about forest and other privileges were settled by the Chief Commissioner in person.

Nipál.—The true cause of the strained relations between the Nipálese and Thibetan Governments was not mentioned in last year's review, as the circumstances had not then been fully ascertained. It appears that at a certain religious festival the Civil Government of Lhasa is temporarily in abeyance. The chief officers withdraw into religious meditation, and the town is given over to the monks of the large monasteries. The members of the chief of these corporations, in number about 7,000, took the opportunity of this annual carnival to make an attack upon the Nipálese traders, who are the most prosperous of the mercantile community in Lhasa, and live in a quarter of their own in that town. The Nipálese wisely allowed their houses to be plundered without resistance, and appealed for indemnity to the Chinese governor, who took their

part and ordered compensation. The ecclesiastical influence, however, was too strong in Thibet to allow an equitable settlement, and the protraction of the negotiations was so irritating to the Nipálese Government that its army was mobilised, and a large force, fully provisioned, was marched to the frontier at Karong, down which pass most of the traffic of Thibet reaches India, and which would doubtless have been blocked had not the Lhasa authorities agreed to pay the Nipálese ten lakhs of rupees with interest in the course of seven years, and to punish the offending monks. This agreement was accepted and ratified in June, after some communications had passed between Nipál and the Government of India on the subject. The trade with Thibet, though not at present large, is likely to be increased as the passes are improved for communication, and British Indian goods obtain a fairer market in Thibet. An interesting voyage of exploration and survey was made in disguise during 1880–84, by one of the native agents of the Indian Survey, all over Thibet and its frontiers, and much useful information about trade as well as physical geography, was brought back by this adventurous Hindoo. The death of the Nipálese commander-in-chief, Dhir Shamshir Jang, brother of the Chief Minister, took place in October, and he was succeeded by General Jait Jang, second son of the late Jang Bahadur.

Burmah.—The state of Upper Burmah was, if possible, worse than during 1883. The Shán States continued a resistance which was certainly effective against any advance of the claims to sovereignty put forward by King Theebaw, and the Kachyin tribes, north-east of Bhámo, broke into open rebellion, and made more than one successful raid, including a partial occupation of the town of Mogoung. On being attacked by Burmese regulars, they retired in safety to their hills, only to return later on and defeat 1,300 of the Burmese troops at Mogoung. In June the tribes were still at this city, and also extending their predatory raids in the Bhámo direction. This latter proceeding led to a further disturbance, for the Chinese traders, to whom Bhámo owes a good deal of its prosperity, after a vigorous resistance to the Kachyins, fortified a temple in their quarter of the town. This was objected to by the Burmese authorities, and led to a collision, in which the Chinese, being worsted, took refuge amongst their late plunderers, the hill tribes. They returned in December with reinforcements of Chinese and hillmen, and captured Bhámo from the Burmese garrison. Gang-robberies increased in frequency all over the kingdom, and though some of the gangs were captured and crucified, the example was of little effect in more remote regions, and the lawlessness showed signs of spreading into Pegu and other parts of British territory. The influence of the Queen and her mother was reported to be still supreme; and the bloodthirsty nature of Theebaw was in none of his previous exploits so manifest as in that with which the autumn closed, namely,

the massacre of over 200 unarmed and defenceless prisoners in the Mandalay prison, including women and children who had attended, as usual, to provide the daily food of the convicts. It was rumoured that the prison contained several political suspects, of whom the Court party was anxious to be rid, so that a simulated *émeute* amongst the convicts was used as the pretext for a general fire on the whole mass of prisoners, kept up by regiments previously posted round the building for the purpose. This proceeding excited the greatest indignation at Rangoon and elsewhere along the Irawaddy, and helped to increase the immigration into British territory of the subjects of Theebaw, who had been removing themselves with their families from his reach during the whole year. There was also considerable scarcity of food in his dominions, and the large quantity of rice sent up from Lower Burmah seems to have affected the exports to Europe in some degree. The political troubles of Theebaw were no less than last year. The "Mengoon" Prince, who had taken refuge in Chander-nagore from the Chunár Fort, where he had been interned by the British authorities, managed to escape in disguise to Colombo, and thence to Pondichery, so as to be again under French protection. The fear lest he should be released had possibly some effect upon the negotiations which Theebaw was carrying on in France; but still greater pressure could be brought to bear on the latter, it was alleged, by means of the extension of French influence in Tonquin, and the threatening activity of that Power along the frontier of Siam. The explorations begun or suggested by Mr. Colquhoun were continued this year from the eastern frontier to Zimmé, working up, too, from Bangkok, through Siam and the Shán states. The upper waters of the Mekong River were also visited, and it was ascertained that there was no insuperable difficulty in the way of a future railroad between Martaban and the Gulf of Tonquin. For the greater part of the year, however, Mr. Colquhoun was engaged with the French army as war correspondent for a London journal. He obtained guarantees and promises of aid for a further journey across from China to Burmah by a new route, without having time to avail himself of them.

In British Burmah there is little worthy of note to record. The railroad between Pegu and Tonghoo was opened halfway; the military outposts along the eastern frontier were strengthened, and there was no doubt an increase of gang-robberies, said to be due to the difficulty in obtaining convictions by reason of want of harmony between the views about evidence held respectively by the police and the trying authorities.

North-west.—Passing now to the other side of the continent, the most important event we have to record is the punitive expedition against the Saran-Kheyl Patháns of the Zhob valley. This valley is inhabited by several sections or clans of Patháns, amongst whom the Musa Kheyl are the most adventurous and hostile to the British, and were led by one Sháh Jehán, who en-

joyed a reputation for sanctity and fanatic zeal for Islam. On April 22 these Patháns made an organised attack upon a party of labourers engaged on road-work near Dukki (or Puh) on the Thal-Chotiali route, and were only beaten off by the lucky arrival of a party of the 3rd Bombay Light Infantry. A punitive expedition was ordered, as this was only one of several similar attacks on unarmed workmen that had been made from the Zhob direction. It was found advisable to defer operations until the autumn, owing to the scarcity of supplies for the attacking force. The presence of over 30,000 men, military and road-labourers, along the Harnai line and other works had strained the local supplies considerably, so a small force only was sent up in May, and entrenched itself at Gumbaz, a point from which the main entrance to the Zhob valley was commanded. This was reinforced towards the end of May. In spite of these precautions an attack was made on the night of June 14 by Musa Kheyl Patháns on an outpost of Thal-Chotiali, which was, however, easily beaten off. It was at first proposed to divide the expeditionary force into two sections, the one advancing from Dera Gházi Khán, the other from Quettah, the whole being under Sir Oriel Tanner; but it was afterwards found that, owing to the still unsettled state of the Waziri tract, it would be advisable to move the whole force up through Mastang and Dukki directly into the Zhob valley from the south. The Brahui Sirdárs of Mastang and its neighbourhood were easily brought to provide supplies and camels, and no difficulty was found in transporting the whole force to its base of operations at Anambar, thirty-five miles north-east of Dukki. The number of troops, &c., was 3,000, consisting of infantry, cavalry, and a few mountain and screw guns, together with an experienced survey party. Everything was favourable to the expedition, as the season had been good for forage, the weather was fine, and the troops well seasoned, and not pressed for time. Sir Robert Sandeman accompanied the expedition in order to arrange matters with the tribes of Patháns who were reported to be at variance with the Musa Kheyl. Meanwhile, the latter had not been idle. Two unimportant raids were made from different points of the Zhob hills, and Shah Jehán had done his best to enlist some of the neighbouring Ghilzais in his favour, though without success. The head-quarters of the expedition started from Quettah on September 20, and as the route had been previously carefully surveyed, the march was soon accomplished. Most of the tribes implicated made immediate submission, and the only one that resisted was brought to the same course by a single smartly fought action. The leaders fled, but some time afterwards were caught and made to give compensation for their past and hostages for their future conduct. Shah Jehán, however, managed to take refuge amongst friendly Ghilzais at a distance. The troops were withdrawn late in November. The results of the expedition were valuable in more ways than the immediate punishment of the tribes, for an accurate survey was made of the

country adjacent to that surveyed last year from the Sulaimán range westwards. The operations led to the discovery of the most practicable Kafilá route from the Deraját by the Gomal to Kandahar. It was hitherto believed that this lay through the Zhob valley, but the survey of 6,000 miles of country, connecting Pishin with the tract surveyed last year in the Sulaimán range, proved that a large army could be conveyed through the Khwandár valley, whilst nothing beyond forage could be got in Zhob. In a military aspect, too, the expedition was indirectly useful beyond its immediate and punitive object, as it took the place of a large and costly camp of exercise which had previously been proposed to be held at Hasan Abdul in the Panjáb.

In Baluchisthán, the long outstanding disputes between the Khán of Khilát and Sirdár Azád Khán induced Sir R. Sandeman to make a complete tour of the country. In addition to settling the various differences, political and revenue, which he found to prevail between the various chiefs, the agent was able to have surveyed in general outline over 20,000 miles of country, and the whole tract connected with the general triangulation of India.

Swát, Agror, &c.—In the north-western corner of the frontier the disturbances in Swát continued. The fraternal struggle assumed various phases, as on one occasion Mian Gul, eldest son of the late Akhund, was actually captured and imprisoned by his brother; whilst on another, the former and Rahimatullah, Khán of Dir, were said to be projecting the partition between themselves of the Bajaur district, a step which could have been at once utilised to their detriment by the Amir of Kábul, who had been for some time awaiting a pretext for interference. The death of Rahimatullah, which was reported to have taken place in October, gave some hopes of a settlement, though the overtures made to and by the Amir in August had no immediate results, and the year closed, leaving half the country again in the hands of the previously dispossessed Mian Gul.

The proceedings in *Agror* consisted of a series of more or less extensive raids by the Chagarzais on Dilbori and other large villages. The chief of Agror had been accustomed to depend a good deal upon the support of the British garrison at Abbotabad in cases of this kind, and it was only by the unwonted vigour of the villagers that the attack of Abdullah Khán, the leader of the Chagarzais, was beaten off. The British authorities, however, moved troops up to Ughi from Abbotabad, but not in time for them to take part in the repulse of the hill tribes. Several other raids took place, in one of which the Chagarzais received a severe lesson from a small body of British troops posted beforehand in the neighbourhood. The Khán of Agror, having made conciliatory overtures to the local British officers, obtained some aid against future attacks of this sort.

In the Khaibar there are the usual minor raids to record. Shinwáris, aided, it was said, by a few of the Zakka Kheyls, were

repulsed with some loss in an attack on a rich caravan near Lundi Kotal, and a few thefts of arms from outposts were successful. The British lost a staunch friend in Abdulla Nur, chief of the Kuki Kheyl Afridis, who fell in a blood-feud. The attempt of the Amir of Kábul to extend his influence over the frontier tribes in close relations with the British was abandoned, on representations of the complications and inconvenience to both Powers in case of a double or a doubtful *régime* being introduced. The Aka Kheyls demanded a share of the Khaibar allowance paid from Indian revenues; and to enforce their claims, made a successful raid on the Kaka Kheyl within Peshawar limits. A fine was imposed, but not paid without some resistance. The Kohát frontier was still disturbed by the presence of Kamál, the bandit who has for the last two years succeeded in eluding capture; but the only raid in this direction was made on purely private grounds, and not for plunder. From the extreme north-west came rumours of intended raids on Afghan tribes by the Kafirs, though nothing definite was done in pursuance of this often-heard report. Yásin was disturbed by the return of Pehlwan Báhadur, who was exiled from that State during Major Biddulph's residence in Gilgit, and who got together a sufficient following for an attack on some outlying forts, not far from Yásin itself. Communications of courtesy were officially received, as usual, by the Viceroy, from the Amir of Chitrál, though little information was obtained regarding the state of the frontier immediately below that territory. The completion of the Gomal River and Sulaimán survey was aided by the friendly attitude of the Waziris, so that, in recognition of this change in demeanour, the Government of India released from prison the Mahsudi leaders who had been sentenced on account of the Tonk raid of 1881. The only disturbance in their country was an inter-tribal feud, which ended in a raid on a Shiráni village on the Gomal in May, on which occasion the police sent to assist only succeeded in securing hostages, whilst the leaders got off to the hills.

C. BRITISH INDIA.

On December 3rd the Marquess of Ripon relinquished the reins of government, and gave place to his successor, the Earl of Dufferin.

The Feudatory States.—He left the relations of the Government of India with the feudatory States, as a rule, cordial and without friction. In February he assisted at the installation of the Nizám at Hydrabád, one of the most extensive and magnificent pageants of the kind ever witnessed in India. Since the death of Sir Salár Jang last year the administration of this large State had been the subject of much anxiety, owing to the want of an equally strong hand to control the rivals for power amongst the nobles. The most experienced official of rank, the Pashkár, being a Hindoo,

was ineligible for the permanent tenure of supreme power. The two leading Muhammadan noblemen were at feud with each other regarding a question of precedence, which had to be settled at the installation. The heir to Sir Salár Jang's estate was a boy of about twenty. The provisional Council of Administration, which had been appointed for a twelvemonth, was found inadequate as a permanent establishment. On the accession of the Nizám, his choice of Mir Liak 'Ali, son of Sir Salár Jang, was approved by the Government of India, and the young Minister was duly appointed. One serious fracas between rival Arab leaders gave evidence of a certain weakness in the administration due probably to the inexperience of the Nizám and his Minister, rather than to timidity or a feeling of insecurity. A Commission of Inquiry was nominated, to which the offender demurred. He was, however, found in fault, and sentenced to a heavy fine, and to removal from the command of his troops, as well as to banishment from the city.

In another State, *Junagadh*, to which some prominence was given in last year's review, a similar occurrence took place, which did not, however, reach so equitable a conclusion. A party of Mekrani irregulars had a dispute with the Nawáb's officers regarding the rent payable for a village held by them. They declined to trust the word of the Nawáb or his Minister that the question would be duly and fairly settled if they would bring it to headquarters, but ensconced themselves within their walled retreat, fired on a considerable body of armed and mounted police sent against them, and brought on a house-to-house fight, in which they were nearly all killed.

The misconduct of the eldest son of the chief of *Indore*, Holkar, excited some attention, and resulted in his deprivation by his father of all jurisdiction. Another event in this State is worthy of record, namely, a claim made by the chief against a mercantile firm for some property escheated thirty-five years back. The books of the firm were forcibly seized, but subsequently an action was brought in regular form in one of the chief's own courts, and the chief called to give evidence of his claim in person. It does not appear that he did so, at least within the calendar year. In *Kolhápúr*, the young chief, who had been insane for some years, died, and was succeeded by a boy adopted by his widow. The selection was of good family, son of the chief of *Kágál*, who is the present Regent, and gave general satisfaction. In *Rajputána* the year began with the surrender to the political agent, backed by a body of the Central India horse, of the citadel of the chief who went into rebellion last year against his suzerain, the Rája of Bikanir. There was no fighting, and the troops, after blowing up the fortifications, returned to their station. In *Meywár* there was a slight affray, in which thirteen men were killed and several wounded, caused by one of the chiefs declining to recognise the decision of the Maharána in a question of succession to an estate.

Legislation.—The year enjoyed an unwonted and tranquillising

exemption from legislative activity. Amongst enactments which became law, one of the most important was a local provision for simplifying legal procedure in the Panjáb. The right of appeal in civil suits was limited within certain bounds of the pecuniary value of the matter in litigation, varying for each grade of tribunal. The executive officers of divisions were relieved, by an increase of the judicial staff, of most of their civil jurisdiction in such suits, and other facilities given for a more speedy determination of disputes. A Telegraph Act, on the lines of that in force in England, also became law, as did also the Panjáb Municipal Act, and local laws regarding similar matters in Bombay. A railway Bill, necessitated by the increase of lines and the introduction of privately managed concerns, was prepared, but before any action was taken on it in council, the proposals were circulated to all commercial and railway authorities likely to be affected by them. The agitation against the Rent Bill in Bengal was maintained throughout the year, and beyond collecting further opinions about it from official sources, the Government took no steps with regard to its enactment. Two points in connection with it merit notice. First, that the opposition meetings were usually held on Sundays, admittedly so as to allow of the attendance of the legal and scholastic element which is essential to all such gatherings in Lower Bengal; the other, a personal dispute on the tenancy question between the Chief Justice of Bengal, who was against the Bill, and the Home Secretary to the Government of India, one of its most ardent supporters. Sir Richard Garth indited a strongly worded minute on the subject, animadverting on the action of the Government through its Secretary, and on the previous disregard manifested by Lord Ripon's Government for the views of High Court judicial authorities. So unusual a departure from official procedure produced a good deal of local ferment. The native press was almost ludicrously anxious to avail themselves of the judicial protest against the Rent Bill, which they detested, whilst defending from the English judges their favourite, Lord Ripon, whom they idolised. Beyond Bengal the matter was scarcely noticed, save by passing comment.

No events of importance in connection with the army and navy took place during the year. A movement in favour of an organisation in order to find employment for soldiers on their reversion to civil life was set on foot in Bombay, where it was carried into effect, and before the end of the year it had gained ground in Upper India and Madras. It was intended that this provision should encourage the enlistment of a good class of men, who would feel themselves comfortably provided for at the expiration of their service with the colours. Camps of exercise were held at Bangalore and Mián-Mir, the former attended by most of the military magnates of the continent. The Indian marine was placed under the operation of a Discipline Act passed by the Imperial Legislature to supply the place of that repealed on the

abolition of the Indian navy some years ago. In time of peace the naval forces are now subordinate to the authority of the Government of India, in time of war to the naval commander-in-chief.

Finance.—The financial administration changed hands in the middle of the Budget year, when Sir E. Baring was re-transferred to Egypt, and Sir A. Colvin returned from the latter country to India. It was obvious, therefore, that no modification of the system in force could be undertaken by the new-comer, who contented himself with the strict continuation of what he described as the policy of observation initiated by his predecessor. The radical changes introduced in 1882–83 with regard to the two great sources of revenue, customs and salt, added to the uncertainty of the opium returns for 1883–84, rendered extreme caution a matter of the utmost necessity; and the new Finance Minister was fortunate enough to be aided in his task by the unlooked-for prosperity of the country in general during both the seasons to which this review relates.

Public criticism was, on the whole, not unfavourable to the account of the financial position of the Government. One of the points which met with considerable opposition was the omission to ascertain, before the end of the financial year, whether the loan of two and a half millions, which is usually required in the middle of the coming year, would be raised in India, or by a reduction in the amount of drawings by the Secretary of State in England. Again, the abolition of the export duty on rice, the reduction of the stamp duties, and the modification or withdrawal of the licence tax, were all questions with which the Indian press anticipated that Sir A. Colvin would grapple; and disappointment was also expressed at the absence of any special mention of the railway policy of Government, and of the failure of the stock-note system. On the other hand, the great improvement of the actual and the revised estimates over the original calculations of revenue were warmly appreciated, as evidence not only of careful administration, but of the increasing prosperity of the country at large, as well as of an elasticity of resources which had been for some years persistently denied to Indian revenues by some writers in the press both in India and in England.

As no legislation was called for, the Budget statement took the form of a minute signed by the Financial Member of Council, and presumably approved by the Executive Council before its publication in the middle of March. Its discussion was therefore reserved for the press alone, as there was no occasion or warrant for its production before the Legislative Council of India. It dealt with the usual three topics: first, the accounts of the preceding year, ending March 31, 1883; then with the revised estimates for the current year, or 1883–84; and lastly, with the estimates for the year to end with March 1885. The system of accounts was modified only in the case of railway and provincial transactions.

Accounts of 1882-83.—These may, as usual, be dismissed with but short comment, as they have long since passed into history. The surplus at the end of the year was 706,633*l.*, or more than 421,600*l.* in excess of the estimate, though the extraordinary expenditure was heavy, on account of the expedition to Egypt, and the loss on exchange was above the sum anticipated. The ordinary receipts exceeded the estimate by 139,500*l.*, whilst the ordinary expenditure was but 10,400*l.* in excess of the Budget. The cost of the Egyptian expedition undertaken by India was 1,284,000*l.*; and if the English contribution of 500,000*l.* be deducted, together with minor credits, the net charge debited is returned at 699,300*l.* The loss by exchange was 306,400*l.* more than was expected, of which 114,000*l.* was on account of transactions in connection with the Southern Maratha Railway, and the remainder was on the usual bills of the Secretary of State. The favourable result at the close of the year is due mainly to improvements in land revenue, irrigation, excise, salt customs, and forest receipts. The military accounts were in close accordance with the estimates.

Revised Estimates for 1883-84.—These were based on the accounts for the current year up to the end of December 1883, and are therefore within a little of the actuals. The general results were that the revenue exceeded the ordinary estimates by 1,547,900*l.*, and the expenditure by 1,733,500*l.*, and that the surplus was 271,400*l.*, instead of 457,000*l.* But it must be borne in mind that an addition of 1,500,000*l.* to the estimated remittances to the Secretary of State was made early in the year, the exchange on which was about 346,000*l.*, and a payment of 1,000,000*l.* on account of arrears of non-effective charges connected with the British army serving in India was also made to the Home Treasury, both these items being in “true sterling,” and not, as in the case of the other amounts quoted in this review, in the conventional calculation of rupee-tenths. If these two items are omitted, the surplus would amount to 1,160,400*l.* more than the estimate. This satisfactory financial result was due to the expansion of the revenue from opium, salt, stamps, excise, assessed taxes, and forests, amounting to 800,000*l.*, and to a net increase of 390,900*l.* from public works, irrigational and railway. In connection with the last item it may be pointed out that it was greatly due to the increasing export trade that the Government of India was able, during the period under review, to meet an unexpected demand, amounting to 1,346,000*l.*, as above stated, and yet show a small surplus at the end of the year. As regards the military charge, it was explained that the Government of India were aware that the intricate calculations involved in the adjustment of these accounts were in progress, but they were quite unprepared for a sudden demand for so large a remittance as 2,250,000*l.* in true sterling. Proposals have been made, it is stated, for the gradual acquittal of this debt through the annually

decreasing burden of non-effective charges under the short-service system, but these suggestions had not, up to the end of the year, received the final sanction of the Home Government.

The changes in the main sources of revenue, as compared with the first estimates, may now be briefly described. In the first place, the *opium* crop turned out a short one, which implied a smaller sum to be disbursed by Government to the cultivators; on the other hand, the sales realised in Bengal a somewhat higher sum than was expected, although the export of Málwa opium from Bombay was less. It was also found that the substitution of the Málwa produce for Bengal in parts of Northern and Eastern India was advantageous to the exchequer under certain conditions of the market, and not unpalatable to the consumer. At the same time it was not found possible, as will be seen from the Budget for the coming year, to place reliance upon a continuance of the present revenue from this source. *Excise* showed a considerable increase in Bombay and in Northern and Eastern India. Similarly, the receipts from *Forests* are becoming yearly of more importance as operations in conservancy are extending, more especially in Burmah and Bombay. Omitting minor items, and all adjustments and mere book transactions, the salt revenue, with the export trade, and the State connection with railroads, will be found to have been the most important and interesting questions of the year. The *Salt* tax was equalised over all the greater divisions of the empire in 1882-83, and at that time it was expected that increased consumption would eventually compensate the Treasury for the considerable local reduction in duty. The prognostication has turned out correct, as the increase during 1883-84 amounted to over $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., ranging from $4\frac{1}{2}$ in the Inland customs district (Northern India) to $21\frac{1}{2}$ in Madras. Even in Bombay, where the duty was slightly raised, the increase was over 9·8 per cent. The increased salt revenue for the year was about 60,000*l.* over the estimate, and, to all appearances, was on the way to fulfil Sir E. Baring's anticipation. The receipts from railways were shown in a comparative table from 1880-81 onwards, and amounted to an aggregate gain of 3,271,000*l.* in the five years concerned. Sir A. Colvin hesitated to regard the connection of the State with these undertakings as a permanent source of revenue, as he bore prominently in mind, when commenting on the development of enterprise in this direction, the paramount claims of cheap transport for the raw produce of the country. The net gain to the State in 1882-83 was 419,340*l.*—the revised estimates under review give 787,530*l.*—and a return of 1,079,240*l.* is estimated for in 1884-85. In 1880-81 there was a net *loss* of 50,600*l.* under this head.

In connection with the question of further extending the State connection with railroads, Sir A. Colvin took the opportunity of pointing out that the commercial bodies who had addressed Government at different times in furtherance of a more energetic policy in railway-making, seemed to have in view the increase of the

action of the State to the diminution of private enterprise and responsibility. He quoted a leading article on this question in the *Economist* of February 2, 1884, with approval, especially the argument used that if railroad enterprise in India were as remunerative as his figures showed, and as the mercantile community asserted it to be, the abstention of the public to invest money in it appeared inconsistent and inexplicable, and the sooner the public got rid of the "Government crutch," and learnt to walk alone in this respect, the better for the country at large. He utilised the Parliamentary Committee on Indian Railroads, of which mention is made elsewhere, as a sufficient reason for not entering upon any exposition or discussion of the views and proposals of the existing Government. Closely connected with the extension of communication is the growth of trade. Amongst imports, that of gold was especially remarkable, and is stated to have amounted to no less than 20,000,000*l.* sterling in the five years ending with March 1884. The export of bread-stuffs, wheat in particular, is also prominently brought forward in the Budget statement. It appears that in 1883 India came next to the United States and Russia in the supply of wheat to the mother country, and the trade in oil-seeds showed also a considerable briskness. A curious indication of the condition of a population like that of India, amongst whom the investment of savings *at interest* is almost unknown, is found in the Mint returns. These show, amongst other details, the value of gold and silver ornaments sent to the Mint for coinage. The two mints of Bombay and Calcutta received together 124 lakhs of rupees' worth of such ornaments during the famine time of 1877-78, and the amount has been since falling by large decrements, until it was only about 5,000*l.* in 1882 and 1883. Judging from the returns of the period preceding the last famine, it seems evident that during the last two years the process of accumulation has recommenced throughout the districts where previous savings had to be parted with in the distress of seven years ago. It is also noteworthy that the Post Office Savings Banks have had, during their short existence, a success equal to what was expected of them, except in the towns of Calcutta and Madras, where there are numerous ways of profitably investing small savings. The only financial scheme that has as yet failed, out of those set in motion during the last five years, is that of Stock Notes, of which only 190,400*l.* worth were issued up to the end of 1883.

The Estimates for 1884-85, published with the above accounts, are liable to vary considerably from the revised estimates prepared on the experience of April to December 1884, especially in the items of opium, railway traffic, and land revenue, all of which are dependent partly upon the season in India, partly upon the crops of distant countries, and, in the case of opium, upon political disturbances in the far East. The general results showed an estimated revenue of 70,560,400*l.*, or nearly that of the revised

estimates of 1883-84, against an expenditure (chargeable thereon) of 70,241,100*l.*, or less than that finally estimated for by 57,400*l.* The opium receipts were placed at a low average, partly on account of the necessity of replenishing the reserve by restricting the number of chests placed in the market, and partly owing to the prospects of a good crop in Bengal during the summer of 1884, entailing a considerable addition to the expenditure on raw material in the season of 1883. It was anticipated by Sir A. Colvin that the disputes between China and Tonquin would affect the opium traffic, but, as events turned out, this result was not apparent up to the end of the calendar year. The reports on opium supplied to China from other than Indian sources seem to have been to the effect that the Persian drug found a market only in the single district of Wahu, but that indigenous opium from Yunan and Szechwan was largely imported by way of Chung-King. The revenue from salt, stamps, and forests was expected to be slightly progressive, as during 1883-84. The prospective purchase of the Eastern Bengal Railway, the expansion of traffic on recently opened State lines, and the expected extension of the State system caused an estimated increase in the cost of productive and protective public works, against which was set an estimated increased return from those purchased or open. It is worthy of note that Sir A. Colvin did not think it safe to accept the large increase of wheat traffic from the Punjáb to Karachi as likely to be permanent, though the competition of the Indus Valley route with those inland is of growing importance.

One of the most novel and important announcements made through the medium of the Budget statement was that connected with the settlement and revision of the assessment on the land of the State charge. In order to obviate the future employment of extensive survey operations, it was proposed to base all revision in tracts which had been once carefully surveyed and settled on general considerations and fixed principles, irrespective of remeasurements and classification.

The Ways and Means paragraph was chiefly remarkable for the reticence mentioned above regarding the annual loan, but the estimates were framed on the basis of a loan to be raised in India, not on that of a reduction of the Home drawings. In the then state of the money market, too, it was not found advisable to devote the 573,100*l.* available from the Insurance and Relief Fund to the reduction of existing debt, but it was announced that this amount would be utilised to strengthen the cash balances, and thus obviate to that extent the necessity for borrowing. Ultimately no loan was raised at all, owing to arrangements in England, under which the half-million contribution on account of the Afghan war was raised to a million, and the large deposit of railway capital, together with the conversion of debt and paying off three millions in debentures, helped to swell the balance at credit in the Secretary of State's treasury.

Public Works.—The Railway Committee of Parliament was appointed practically to adjudicate between the Government of India and the Secretary of State on three main points, regarding which they were at variance. These points were, firstly, the undertaking of works not likely to be “productive” to the extent or within the time prescribed by the Secretary of State; secondly, the incurrence of expenditure heavier than that sanctioned by the present standing orders, on works either carried out directly by the State, or under some sort of State guarantee; lastly, the capitalisation of some portion (200,000*l.* annually) of the Famine Insurance Fund for payment of interest on productive and protective works. The Committee was a large one, and included independent members as well as experts and the Under Secretary of State for India, who represented the views of the India Office. The two contending parties provided respectively a full array of witnesses, statistics, and opinions, so that a definite policy of one kind or the other was expected to result from the deliberations of the Committee. The actual results appear to have disappointed all concerned, except, perhaps, the officials of the India Office, as, except on one point (the adoption of the broad gauge for all lines save local branches), the report of the Committee either spoke with uncertainty, or proposed to throw the whole task of decision upon the Secretary of State, the very course which it was appointed to obviate. On one question alone, of those submitted to it, was its opinion clearly enunciated, and that was its opposition to the proposal to utilise a portion of the Famine Fund to obtain the capital necessary for protective railways. The prohibition of this course, and the adoption of the broad gauge for all the longer lines, were expected in India to be the only practical result of the Committee’s labours. The proposals of the Government of India, which the Committee asserted “would have most beneficial results,” included the construction in five years of 4,000 miles of line, at the cost of twenty-eight and a half millions, of which lines about one-half would be undertaken by the State, and the remainder under guarantee. There are about five and a half millions in addition proposed for the improvement of existing lines. All these are productive and protective, and some 3,400 miles in addition were proposed to be constructed at a cost of about twenty-four millions, after the above had been completed, but not by the State, or under guarantee, the only aid being the free grant of the necessary land.

The actual progress of works during the year was considerable, though none of the larger projects were started. Short lines, feeders to existing main routes of traffic, were completed or advanced, and a few changes in administration took place. The Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Guaranteed Company obtained a lease of the Rajputána-Málwa State line for sixteen years, on terms acceptable to both the State and the Company. Branch lines to Sialkot, between Ferozpur and Rewári, Amritsar, and

Pathankote were opened, and sections of the Bellary-Hubli, Bengal-Central, Faizabad-Baraich, Cawnpore-Hatras, and Rohilkhand-Kumaon lines were completed. In Mysore a line to Tumkur was opened in August, and its extension surveyed. The Belgaum-Poona line of the Southern Maratha and West Deccan system was begun, and the East Deccan line (Hotgi-Gadag) opened for traffic. Politically speaking, the most interesting and important undertaking of this description was the continuation of the frontier line from Sibi round the Bolán range of mountains to the Harnai valley, and thence into Quettah. The official designation of this line was changed to the "Sind-Pishin" from the "Kandahar" line, by which it had previously been generally known. It was abandoned in 1880, and carried only as far as the foot of the hills. It was now decided that it should be brought to Quettah, and possibly as far as the British outposts in the Pishin valley within a couple of years or so, though the information given officially on this point was, as may be expected, extremely vague and slight. Meanwhile, the cart road through the Bolán Pass, which is some fifty miles shorter than the Harnai route, was completed above flood level, so that it is now passable even when the river is swollen by rain or snow.

There are few of the other public works completed during the year that require special notice. Some improvements were made at the Kidderpore docks below Calcutta; and the Madras Harbour works, which were breached and partially destroyed in 1881, were still the subject of much professional discussion without practical improvement.

Commerce.—The year was one of quiet markets, and was not marked by any extraordinary fluctuations. The good wheat harvest of the year not having been confined to India, there was not such a demand for freight as last year, but, on the whole, the trade in raw produce as well as in import transactions was favourable to the Indian merchant. The complications in China affected only the end of the year, and that to a comparatively limited extent. The supplies of yarn had been sent in beforehand from Bombay, and nothing occurred to interfere with the Calcutta exports of opium. It was even anticipated that an impulse would be given to Indian tea by a possible stoppage of the Chinese shipments. In other respects the Indian tea trade, which started under good auspices in Canada and Australia, showed signs of languishing. It is pushed out of Central Asia, both by the present preference of the Turkomans for the highly flavoured "Brick tea" of China, and by the prohibitive duties at all the Russian frontier stations. Endeavours were made late in the year to push the inland trade with Thibet, and Mr. Dalglish, the Calcutta merchant, repeated his annual venture with a considerable caravan to Yarkand. He found himself forestalled, however, by Russian goods, as that nation has a resident consul at Kashgar, who is stated to have got complete command of the market for his country-

men's products. In India itself, it was reported by the Bombay Millowners' Association that the taste is towards English piece-goods, so some steps were proposed (though not taken within the year) to push the stronger and coarser fabrics of India into the African market, where the field has been reported by Zanzibar and Aden merchants to be open and likely to prove remunerative. In spite of the losses in the gold-mining fever, there were renewals of the attempt to exploit certain natural products, as the petroleum wells of Arracan, coal in Assam, and antimony in the Waziri hills on the western frontier. It was stated that the Government surveyors had reported a considerable area containing petroleum springs on the road to Quetta, and that machinery for boring and other operations had been sent for from Canada. The import returns showed a curiously large increase in the stock of luxuries introduced from foreign parts, both ornaments and articles of apparel, indicating, like the import and absorption of bullion, the increased wealth of the masses. The only great misfortune that befell any commercial undertaking during the year was the failure of the Oriental Bank, which affected the depositors and shareholders more than the general commercial community, and was felt more severely in Ceylon and Madras than in the larger circles of Bombay and Calcutta. Exchange remained throughout the year at low rates, except for a month or two, when the rupee rose almost to 1s. 8d. in value. The official rate was fixed at 1s. 7½d., against 1s. 8d. of 1882-83.

Health and Epidemics.—Two Commissions of Inquiry regarding the probable origin of cholera visited India during the year, but neither resulted in any decision accepted by the general body of medical experts. The great want of proper sanitation in Calcutta caused a considerable ferment amongst both European and native residents of that city, and resulted in a temporary split between the local Government and the Municipal Corporation, which caused much discussion in Bengal.

The Season, &c.—The sudden and lengthened cessation of rain in July caused some injury to the autumn crops in the west of India and parts of Madras. Similarly, a partial drought produced a decided scarcity of food grain in Birbhum and a few other districts of Bengal. Luckily, in both cases rain fell just in time to prevent an actual famine, though in Bengal some small public works were set on foot for the relief of the labouring classes. In Mysore the early crops were only saved by a timely fall of rain from the north-east, and preparations for relief works on a proposed line of railway extension were made. In addition to the cyclone already mentioned as having damaged the harbour of Akyab, when the lighthouse was washed away, the calamities of the year include two heavy floods of the Tapti, in both of which damage was done to the railway line, as well as to the growing crops. There were also floods at Umballa in July, which did a good deal of injury to the town. And on November 21 a cyclone

at Madras greatly damaged the embankment of the tank which supplies the town with drinking water, besides injuring the railway line, and some of the buildings in the town.

Miscellaneous Events, &c.—The first International *Exhibition* held in India was opened early in December 1883, and closed on March 10, 1884, having been visited by over 830,000 people. From certain points of view it was undoubtedly successful. The number of exhibitors, the arrangement of the exhibits, and the attendance of the higher classes of natives were all satisfactory. But much doubt has been expressed during the year as to the effect upon Indian trade; and though a second is to be held at Bombay in 1886, guaranteed by a large number of subscribers, the undertaking is said to be dictated quite as much by rivalry with Calcutta as by any real expectations of practical or permanent advantage to trade and industry.—Amongst the *deaths* of the year may be mentioned those of Sir Bartle Frere, the Nawab Názim, Saiad Mansur, 'Ali Khan, Jiwan Baksh, the Rana of Oudaipur, Keshub Chunder Sen, and Rai Bahadur Kristodas Pál.

The tours of the Viceroy were somewhat more interesting than usual. Early in February, Lord Ripon passed from Calcutta through Madras, *en route* to Hydrabád, where he formally placed the young Nizám in plenary charge of this great and important State. Later in the year Lord Ripon made a tour in Kashmir, and on his return from Simla to Calcutta he took occasion to stop a little at each of the great cities on the way. His tours were a succession of crowded and enthusiastic receptions. He met Lord Dufferin, his successor, in Calcutta on December 13, and left for Bombay on the 15th. It is enough to record of him in this review that no preceding Viceroy had moved public opinion (such as exists in India) to the extent that Lord Ripon moved it, and it is in the outburst of strong personal sentiment that the historian will find the most remarkable feature of this viceroyalty.

Public Opinion.—The race-schism excited by the ill-advised, ill-managed, and ill-withdrawn attempt of 1883 to modify the criminal procedure law was as wide as ever during the whole of the year under review, and tainted nearly all of the views expressed by the small communities represented in the press, whether native or English, more especially in Bengal. Most of this feeling arose in Calcutta, where, as was mentioned in last year's review, not only the so-called 'Ilbert Bill,' but the Rent Bill for the Lower Provinces, and other measures, were most immediately applicable, and where the Viceroy was present in their midst; but it was also prevalent throughout India, to a greater or less degree, according to the popularity of the local administration in the eyes of the natives of the chief towns. In Madras public opinion was still strongly excited about the Salem riots of 1882, in which a number of the leading Hindus, persons of wealth, and therefore of great repute in that town, had been convicted of exciting, and even of joining in, attacks upon the Muhammadans. Added to this was

apparently a special animosity against the local officials, from the Governor downwards, fomented by the Madras city press, Hindu and European. The successful suit brought against the Government by one of the Salem Hindus, who had been dismissed from the Corporation for supposed (but not proved) complicity in the religious disputes, and his equally successful prosecution of his accusers, for perjury, gave an impetus to the feeling against the Government; and towards the end of the autumn the latter found it judicious to exercise the prerogative of pardon, and remit the remainder of the sentence passed on the rioters, nominally on account of the continued peace of the town of Salem since the admonitory measures of 1882 had been taken. The published papers in the case showed that at the time of conviction it had been the intention of Mr. Grant Duff to take this step if the townspeople proved worthy of it by their subsequent conduct. As between Hindus and Muhammadans, the race animosity so strongly manifested in the Salem riots was comparatively quiescent during 1884. At the Muharram festival there were, as usual, riots in towns where the police precautions were too lax, the aggressors being, this year, fairly equally divided between the two races. In Masulipatam, the Hindus, reinforced from outside the town, made a deliberate onslaught on the Muhammadans. On the other hand, the reverse took place in Agra and another town on the Jamna, where rival festivals took place simultaneously. In Sholapur a comparatively insignificant riot was begun by the Muhammadanis. The cause in almost all these occurrences was the same, namely, the persistence in playing music whilst the procession passed the rival mosque or temple. Riots were also recorded at Cambay and in Karnul. In the former the combatants were Sunni Muhammadans against Shiah; in the latter, Hindus attacked native Christians. The Muhammadans throughout India no doubt took a considerable though vague and indefinite interest in the movements of the Mahdi, but his appearance from the west seems to have conflicted with the notions locally disseminated long before the arrival in the Soudan of Muhammad Ahmad, and no general or organised opinion regarding his career was expressed.

Amongst other curious subjects that have attracted the journalistic fervour of the year is the annual emigration to the hill stations of the members of Government. The ball was set rolling in Madras, where a large staff accompanies the local magnates to Ootacamund for about eight months, and several petitions against this exodus were got up, numerously signed, and sent to members of both Houses of Parliament. In Calcutta, too, meetings were held, and the absence of the Viceroy at Simla, and the Lieutenant-Governor at Darjiling, were made the subjects of addresses and remonstrances. The disestablishment, in whole or in part, of the English Church was also the subject of much discussion and misunderstanding, and the official correspondence published regarding it ended, as was expected, in the post-

ponement of action to some future date. The transmission of a despatch, signed by Lord Ripon and Mr. Ilbert alone, the five other members of the executive Government being dissentients, and the cold return of this document by Lord Kimberley, afforded much food for journalistic talent. The Education Commission resulted in a ponderous report in numerous volumes, giving a very complete account of the condition of education in India in the year 1883, but bearing no fruit beyond a lukewarm expression of opinion in general terms by the Government of India and the Secretary of State.

To sum up:—The year was not without its causes for anxiety, at home and abroad. The acquisition by Russia of Merv and Sarakhs, the evident approach of complications between that Power and the Amir of Afghanistan regarding the semi-civilised tribes haunting the districts north of the Hindu Kush range, and owning allegiance practically to no one—these were burning questions in one direction. In another was the chance of war between Nipál and Thibet, which would have had serious consequences had China supported her immediate vassal. On the east, Burmah beyond the British frontier was in a state of anarchy. The tribes pressing directly upon the Ava territory on the east and south became a much more serious political factor as soon as the French army occupied, without administering, the adjacent districts of Tonquin and Annam.

Home affairs, too, were not altogether in a satisfactory condition. In the most important native State a complete change in the *personnel* of the administration took place at a time when there was a chance that the sympathies of the turbulent spirits of the State could be actively engaged on behalf of their co-religionists in Egypt and Arabia. Then, in a considerable tract, there was for a few months a fear lest the crops should fail to an extent that might result in famine. The passions of the educated classes, English and Europeans, had been excited throughout India by the race agitation of 1883, and hopes had been raised in the minds of the comparatively small and isolated class of the town-bred natives of the literate castes of concessions which could not but prove, at all events for many years, illusory. The harvest of the preceding cold season was excellent, which is all-important in India; the extension of the railway system, though at present slow, was advocated on lines which give promise of a useful and remunerative development within the next decade. Trade increased in directions indicative of a raised standard of comfort, and a greater diffusion of what are no doubt luxuries to most consumers of tastes as simple as those of the people of India, whilst the financial position of the country was decidedly more favourable than was expected a few years back. Finally, whoever may claim to be the originator of a self-government policy, Lord Ripon could justly look back upon the practical beginnings of the elective system, small as they were, as entirely the work of his administration.

CHINA.

The opening year found the Chinese seriously alarmed at the progress of the French in Tonquin, and the latter, elated with their recent success at Sontay, pushing on to attack Bacninh. Although it had been officially announced by China that the positions on the Red River would be defended by imperial troops, and that the capture of such positions would be regarded as a *casus belli*, yet Sontay had fallen, and China had not declared war. The Court of Peking was evidently reluctant to take this irrevocable step, and France naturally preferred a condition of affairs which might justify the claim for an indemnity for the trouble and expense of putting down the insurrection in Tonquin and driving the Black Flags over the Chinese frontier. The fall of Sontay, however, seemed for a moment at least to give strength to the peace party at Peking. It was represented that the Emperor might not be indisposed to put up with the wrongs inflicted upon his vassal, the King of Annam, and the outrages upon his own dignity, if France would return to her original policy in Tonquin, and abstain from further hostile action on the delta of the Red River, the navigation of the Songkoi being made subject to the joint control of the two nations. China could feel her rights secure with Quang-yen, Bacninh, and Laokai in her possession; whilst France, the mistress of Haiphong, Haidzuong, and Hanoi, had obtained material guarantees, leaving the question of the permanent retention of Sontay to be settled by arbitration. As, however, China made no definite proposals, and as France was bent on seizing Bacninh, it was suggested that the United States Government might be asked to mediate between the two countries, under one of the clauses of the Burlingame Treaty. But no pacific overtures ensued. The efforts of the Chinese Government to strengthen their defences were redoubled, and the French continued their advance against Bacninh, the second of the two strongholds which China had forbidden France to touch under threat of a declaration of war. This fortified post lay nearly midway between the two great waterways of the delta—the Red River and the Thai Binh—and a few miles to the north of the “Canal of the Rapids” connecting them.

Immediately after the fall of Sontay, Admiral Courbet had urgently pressed the Home Government to send him reinforcements, at the same time announcing that he intended to advance at once on Bacninh. For some weeks, however, he remained inactive, and on General Millot's arrival at Haiphong (February 11) with his two brigadier-generals, Brière de l'Isle and Négrier, Admiral Courbet was at once superseded. This step caused considerable comment, as during his brief command he had accomplished a good deal. He had taken Sontay and

practically secured the ratification of the recent treaty by the Hué Government; he had also brought about the smooth and efficient working of the sister services.

General Millot's first step was to issue, as his predecessors had done, a proclamation to the Tonquinese, promising to free the country of robbers, and to extend protection to all who accepted the French Protectorate. There were now about 16,000 French troops in Tonquin, to be increased shortly to 25,000, and General Millot decided to push on to Bacninh as soon as the heavy rains had ceased. A balloon corps joined the army, and the method of observation was to keep the balloons anchored, and communicate by wire the topography of the country and the enemy's movements. On March 8, Generals Millot and Brière de l'Isle started from Hanoi with 6,000 men, and Négrier from Haidzuong with a like force. By means of the balloons communications were maintained between the two army corps, whilst by the help of the electric light the artillery operations were directed when the town was approached. The citadel itself stood in a plain three miles from the nearest point on the river, having six bastions, with fronts each of 1,000 feet in length, and surrounded by a moat crossed by fixed bridges, whilst the town lay alongside the direct road from Hanoi to Lang-Sôn. The heights about the town once taken, the rest would be easy. General Millot decided to avoid the direct road from Hanoi to Bacninh, which had been very strongly fortified, and turned off along the line of the Canal of the Rapids; then by means of the heliograph he signalled to General Négrier to advance along the road from Haidzuong, and join him at a point on the canal. All the efforts of the Chinese and Annamites had been directed to dig entrenchments and erect redoubts along the direct road; General Millot's manoeuvre, therefore, at first disconcerted and subsequently demoralised them. After four days' arduous march through rice-fields the French troops crossed the canal to the south-east of Bacninh, and General Négrier took five strong hill forts after a feeble resistance. Without further struggle the citadel of Bacninh surrendered (March 12) without firing a shot, but some hours were occupied in capturing the outside fortifications, which extended for miles, and included forts, pagodas, and villages armed with jingalls and old cannon. The French loss was slight; that of the Chinese could not be computed, for the garrison fled in disorder to the west and north. The plan to cut off their retreat failed, for Generals Millot and Brière de l'Isle had been detained by the bad state of the roads, and the flotilla had been unable to break through the stone barricade on the river. Thus the roads to Lang-Sôn and Thai-Nguyen were left open, and the Chinese escaped to their own frontier. Generals Négrier and Brière de l'Isle continued their advance, and by a rapid march surprised the citadel of Gen-slie, about eighteen miles beyond Bacninh. Thai-Nguyen was also seized, and a month later the citadel of Hung-hoa was surrounded by General Brière

de l'Isle, attacked in front by General Négrier, and taken by assault. With this success General Millot's victorious career was brought to a close.

In Paris the meeting of the Chambers was at hand, and the Prime Minister (M. Ferry), wishing to begin the session with a *coup de théâtre*, sent full powers to Commander Fournier, the senior naval officer, who held friendly relations with Li-Hung-Chang, Viceroy of Petchuli, as chief of the peace party in the Celestial Empire. Conferences were secretly held at Enin-Tsuin, and a treaty was signed (May 11), the substance of which was triumphantly imparted to the Chamber by the President of the Council (May 20). By this treaty China acknowledged the protectorate of France over Tonquin and Annam, including Cao-Banh and Lang-Sôn. The provinces of Yunnan, of Konang-Ei, and Konang-Toung were to be opened to French commerce exclusively. In return for these privileges France renounced her claim upon China for a war indemnity for her intervention in the disturbances between French subjects and the 'Black Flags.'

The question of the evacuation remained to be decided. On May 17 a note was presented by Commander Fournier to Li-Hung-Chang. This document stipulated that the citadel of Lang-Sôn should be delivered to the French troops on June 6, as well as Cao-Banh, Chah-Ke, and all the places in the Tonquin territory touching the frontier of Konang-Toung and Konang-si-Om: twenty days later the French troops were to occupy Loo-Kai, and all places in the Tonquin territory touching the territory of Gurnam.

These arrangements were communicated from Paris to General Millot, and a column of about 800 men, under the orders of Colonel Dugenne, started from Bacninh (June 17) to take possession of Lang-Sôn. Arrived (June 23) at Bac-Lé, on the border of the provinces of Bacninh and Lang-Sôn, the French corps was stopped by 4,000 Chinese, and, after a rather sanguinary battle, was obliged to beat a retreat and return to head-quarters. The French Government, informed of this defeat, instructed M. de Semallé (French Chargé d'Affaires in China) to demand reparation. An ultimatum was presented (July 12) to the Tsung-li-Yamen, by which the French Government claimed—1st. Publication in the *Pekin Gazette* of an imperial decree commanding the Chinese troops to evacuate Tonquin without delay. 2nd. As reparation for the violation of the treaty, and as compensation for the maintenance of the expeditionary corps, an indemnity of 250 millions.

China responded to this ultimatum by making the publication, and the decree was inserted in the *Pekin Gazette* (July 17). But the effect of this concession was completely destroyed by the special reservations made in the preamble of the decree. China maintained that the Treaty of Tientsin was purely preliminary, and could only come into operation after the signing of a definitive

treaty. Moreover, the Tsung-li-Yamen pretended that M. Fournier had himself blotted out from the note of May 17 the words relating to the dates of evacuation, and had initialled the margin of the document in proof of the authority of the erasures. The Chinese Government had sent fac-similes of the note to Europe. M. Fournier declared, on his word of honour, that he had erased nothing.

M. Patenôtre, French Minister in China, thereupon took in hand the question of negotiations. He consented (July 13) to make concessions as to time, and to reduce the sum of the indemnity. China offered 80 millions of francs, to be paid in ten years. M. Jules Ferry accepted, but the Chinese negotiators at Shanghai declared (July 24) it was impossible for them to transmit such proposals to the Imperial Court. The indemnity, after some discussion, was reduced to four millions of francs. Complications had arisen in Peking, that hindered any definite action. Of these, the most important, Prince Chun's *coup d'état*, made less stir out of China than might have been expected, partly from want of exact information, and partly from the difficulty of obtaining the clue to the main current of Chinese opinion. But the change was a significant one. Prince Chun, the father of the young Emperor, and guardian of his person, found, by the help of the Empress's mother, little trouble in deposing Prince Kung, and establishing himself as a sort of dictator.

The enlightened and progressive policy that had been followed during the last twenty years, chiefly through the instinct and ability of Li-Hung-Chang, now ran some risk of being succeeded by a Government which would avoid relations with foreign countries, and might urge on hostilities with France. With the fall of Prince Kung it was more than probable that Li-Hung-Chang, who had worked so long with him and filled so large a place in the eyes of foreigners, would fall too. In fact, it was thought the attack on Prince Kung was primarily an attempt to discredit and overthrow Li-Hung-Chang, the advocate of peace, Prince Chun being the recognised leader of the war party. Li-Hung-Chang, however, though impeached by the censors, was not discredited, and his advice was soon sought again. Prince Chun's assumption of power having been brought about by the collapse of the measures taken for the assertion of China's rights in the northern provinces of Tonquin, it seemed likely that a firm and unyielding attitude would now be observed towards France. A diplomatic settlement was, of course, possible; but the Great Powers most interested in Chinese affairs were too preoccupied to do anything to avert a hostile collision. With the failure, therefore, of M. Patenôtre's negotiations, the resumption of hostilities was inevitable. Kelung was at once (Aug. 1) bombarded by the French fleet, and a Chinese edict was sent into the provinces, ordering the authorities to prepare for war. The tricolour flag was hauled down at the French Legation in Peking (Aug. 21), and the interests of French subjects

were entrusted to the Russian Minister. Admiral Courbet gave official notice (Aug. 22) that he had received orders to make reprisals (presumably for the Lang-Sôn affair in June) on the river Min, and firing commenced on the following afternoon. His course of action was subject to much hostile criticism, not only in China, but also in Europe. Whilst still nominally at peace, and presuming on the privileges accorded to friendly nations, his vessels had separately crept up the Min River, and anchored near the Arsenal of Foochow and the Pagoda. The importance of the step to the French was obvious. The Min River can be entered by two channels, of which one is so much obstructed by sandbanks and rapids as to be practically unnavigable. The other, that followed by the French, although intricate and dangerous, is quite practicable for ships of war under the charge of skilled river pilots. At the entrance to this channel is the lower bar, which can only be passed on a flood tide; and just below the Mingan forts is the upper bar. Both these bars and numerous other obstructions the French ships had passed, unmolested and at their leisure, by help of the local pilots, and were thus able to hold the forts, rear or flank. Admiral Courbet's first attack was directed against the Chinese fleet, consisting of eleven vessels, six armed transports, two gunboats, &c. The French heavily-armed ships practically finished the combat in ten minutes. All the Chinese ships but two were destroyed, and the arsenal or dockyard, which was next bombarded, offered scarcely longer resistance. The shore batteries had ceased at 3 P.M., but the French ships kept up their fire on the neighbouring buildings, forts, barracks, and villages until 5 P.M. The scenes on the river, as the dead and wounded men floated by, were terrible, and the loss of life amongst the Chinese was serious. The Mingan forts were next shelled and silenced (Aug. 26), and the Kinpai forts were destroyed (Aug. 28) without resistance on the part of their defenders, who were powerless against an attack from an enemy in their rear. Admiral Courbet, having attained his object, took up a position off the island of Matsoa, at the mouth of the river, whence he made desultory raids along the coast of the mainland. A period of inaction both on sea and land ensued, and diplomatists took advantage of the pause to bring about an understanding. The French Government at first evinced a disposition to treat, but the heads of the Chinese Government so completely repudiated all thought of conciliation that M. Ferry substituted a policy of forfeits for that of reprisals. Admiral Courbet received an order to seize the north point of the island of Formosa, of which the value for its coal mines had been insisted on by the French papers. Operations against Formosa were commenced forthwith (Oct. 1), and whilst Admiral Courbet was attacking the forts of Kelung with the greater part of the fleet, Admiral Lespès devoted himself to Tamsin. Kelung was taken (Oct. 4) after a four days' bombardment; but Lespès was less successful, and was forced to send hastily for reinforcements. With

a total disregard for the convenience of neutrals, Admiral Courbet proclaimed (Oct. 20) the blockade of all ports and roads of the island of Formosa comprised between the south of Cape Nan Shah and the Bay of Soo-an.

The English protested against this step on the grounds of the treaty of 1856, which declared that a blockade to be respected must be effective. As Admiral Courbet had not enough ships to guard the whole coast, the proclamation, therefore, took no effect. Obligated to disembark a fresh number of his ships' crews, reduced to maintaining a defensive attitude in Tamsin and Kelung, and unable to communicate with his lieutenant except by sea, the French Admiral was condemned to inaction, and had to spend the greater part of the winter in waiting for reinforcements.

At Tonquin the situation was still worse. There M. Jules Ferry was a season and a brigade in arrear. General Millot had insisted upon being recalled, and had returned to France, leaving the command of the expeditionary corps to General Brière de l'Isle, with General Négrier under him. A Chinese regiment, which did duty as the vanguard of the great army that was to descend from Yunnan, advanced against Bacninh, and following the Lochnan, attacked the French vanguard (Dec. 8) commanded by Lieutenant-Colonel Dourrier, who was wounded in the engagement, and for a month the situation was critical. The French, however, speedily rallied, and carried the enemy's position near Kep at the point of the bayonet. General Négrier himself was also slightly wounded, but the Chinese were ultimately forced to beat a retreat, and established themselves in the market-place of Chu, where they entrenched themselves securely in a circular fortress covered by Krupp guns, and flanked by five smaller forts defending the Lang-Sôn road, which would also cover their retreat. The French, however, nothing daunted, after a brisk engagement (Dec. 10) turned the left flank of the Chinese. On the following day the Chinese returned to the offensive, but, unable to face the fire of the French artillery, broke and fled. Chu was evacuated by the Chinese under cover of night, and Brière de l'Isle effected an entry there in the morning. In reward for this victory he was promoted to the rank of general of division, and appointed commander-in-chief of the expeditionary corps. He superintended the conquered forts as well as he could, but the weakness of his resources prevented him from either taking the offensive and seizing Lang-Sôn, or clearing the delta of the pirates who devastated it. The Chinese, on the other hand, were acting everywhere on the offensive, adopting a guerrilla warfare, and attempting to draw the enemy into the jungles and hill country. They also repaired and strengthened the river defences of the Min, rendered Fort Arthur impregnable, and availed themselves of the services of European ex-officers, chiefly German, for drilling and leading the soldiery. Telegraph wires were laid down in all directions. Peking was connected with the extreme south, and thus with the outer world.

The Chinese complained that the English allowed the French to refit, coal, and provision at Hong-Kong, and imposed no quarantine, as the French themselves did at Saigon and Haiphong against ships from Kelung. The English Ministry, in face of these representations, at length notified that "the French blockade of Formosa must be taken by the neutral Powers as a notification of a state of war," but no practical steps were taken by the English Government to terminate the injustice being done to China. Steamers continued to land troops, and there was a regular junk traffic; but foreign trade, which had been almost entirely English, was stopped by the blockade, and thrown into the hands of the Chinese, so that English commerce suffered the most from the burdens and restrictions of an irregular state of war.

During the desultory warfare of the last three months of 1884, various efforts were made to arrange the conflict amicably, but without success. The American Minister at Peking announced to Li-Hung-Chang that France had requested the mediation of the United States. Instead of snatching at the offer of peace, the Viceroy declared with scorn that Admiral Courbet's actions in the Min River had avenged the affair of Lang-Sôn twenty-fold, and that for the French to persist in their demand for an indemnity was monstrous. By the Tientsin Treaty every concession had been made to France, and if the French were willing to adhere to its terms—though they had practically broken them by their aggression—China would probably do likewise. Notwithstanding this defiant tone, China was said to be on the point of accepting the proposals made by the American Minister on behalf of France, including a reduced indemnity, when the Marquis Tseng, the Chinese Ambassador at Paris, informed the Government at Peking that France desired "peace at any price." Thereupon the Peking Ministers proposed such terms that no State would communicate them to France.

In London negotiations were attempted on the basis that France was ready to abandon all her claims on the sole condition of China accepting the Tientsin Treaty; but here, too, there was no result, and China evidently reckoned on fighting out the quarrel in Tonquin herself, and accepting there the fortune of war. At the close of the year the situation remained unchanged. It was certain China was now serious in the measures of defence she was taking all over the country. She showed no signs of the rebellious spirit on which the French had confidently counted; her press was surprisingly unanimous, and her people patriotic and united. On the other hand, the French were inactive for want of men, and there were rumours of an expedition to Peking which would require a complete equipment of another 50,000 men. Tamsin was a source of great trouble and difficulty; to occupy this and Kelung, 10,000 more men were required; 15,000 were also wanted in order to maintain the delta, and another 10,000 for the south of Formosa if that was to be attacked. The climate, both in Tonquin

and Formosa, was against Europeans, and the French troops had been decimated by exposure and cholera. If the delta were to be held, it would be necessary to subdue the hill country, and that was said to be unhealthy and infested with brigands. Altogether the prospects of the French were not bright, and great difficulties lay before them. China, notwithstanding her defeats in the summer, was gradually growing stronger and bolder, and now that Li-Hung-Chang was lending his whole strength to the war party, there was practical unanimity among the leading officials at Peking.

JAPAN AND COREA.

During 1884 symptoms grew strong throughout Japan that the throwing open of the country to foreigners could not be long postponed. The educated and governing classes in Japan have for some years wished to establish perfect freedom of intercourse with Western peoples, to grant them every privilege which they themselves enjoy when abroad, and to encourage the introduction of the foreign capital and enterprise so much needed to develop the material resources of their country. The principal obstacles to be removed were the rights and privileges of extra-territoriality and consular jurisdiction conferred by distant treaties. Germany and America were believed to be in favour of the modification proposed by the Japanese Government; and England, after hesitating for a long while, showed a willingness to yield to the strong representations of the Mikado's Government. The internal condition of Japan proved that the steady progress of the past few years had met with no check during the year. According to official information, the paper money in circulation in 1883 was valued at 19,658,070*l.*, as compared with 22,685,558*l.* in 1879. The total debt in 1883 was 67,073,237*l.*, as compared with 72,665,594*l.* in 1879. The great bulk of this debt is domestic, and is largely the result of the enterprises entailed by the introduction of the new state of things. The total foreign debt in 1883 is given as 1,781,297*l.*, on which the Japanese have to pay 7 per cent. As a set-off against the debt are various reserve funds, amounting in 1883 to 15 millions sterling. The following is a statement of the revenue and expenditure for the years ending June 30, 1880-84, the first three actual, the last two the budget estimates:—

	1880	1881	1882	1883	1884
	£	£	£	£	£
Revenue . .	12,430,350	12,673,450	14,288,343	13,362,824	15,121,220
Expenditure .	12,063,515	12,628,182	14,269,798	13,362,824	15,121,220

There was thus, in the three years for which the accounts have been made up, an excess of revenue over expenditure. In the budget

of 1883-4 the sum of 1,758,480*l.* is set down for the redemption of the National Debt, of which 668,000*l.* is allotted to the redemption of the paper money, upwards of 2,800,000*l.* having been spent in withdrawing this medium during the past four years. The interest and expenses of the National Debt (apart from its redemption) form the largest item in the budget of 1884, amounting to over 2,900,000*l.* Of the total revenue 57 per cent. is derived from the land tax.

The new army of Japan is modelled on the German system, compulsory service prevailing, and consisted of (in 1883) 105,110 men of all arms. The navy consisted of eight large ships of war (five ironclads) with 122 guns, and eighteen miscellaneous vessels with 103 guns. The population in 1883 was 36,700,118, and the number of foreign residents 6,187. During the spring the Japanese War Minister, with a military suite of twelve officers of all grades, visited Paris and Berlin for the purpose of inspecting the military schools, and of learning all about the drill, organisation, and tactical principles of those countries.

In the construction of railways the Japanese have been advancing rapidly, and there are now 240 miles of railroad open, the first line opened (1872) being that between Tokio and Yokohama, which is 20 miles long. Another line, 62 miles long, connecting Tokio with Takasaki, was begun in June 1882, and completed early in 1884. There are also 4,733 miles of telegraph. The lacquer trade is reported to be rapidly falling off, through the disappearance of the tree from which the varnish is obtained. Formerly it was protected by law, each family of the upper classes being obliged to rear 100 trees, the middle classes 70, and the lower classes 40. Since this law fell into desuetude, the cultivation of the lacquer tree has seriously declined. The trees were cut down without care, and none were planted to replace them, so that they have become exceedingly rare, while the price of lacquer has enormously increased. Similar complaints may be heard of the process of disafforestation going on in Japan since the ancient law, which required every one who cut down a tree to plant two in its place, was abolished.

Corea.—It was probably due to the general condition of feeling in Eastern and Southern Asia that the rebellion, which took place in this country towards the end of the year, attracted so much attention. French proceedings in Tonquin and in Chinese waters had produced so much effervescence in the Oriental mind that all the neighbouring States were more or less affected by it, and it was a matter of surprise that Corea had remained undisturbed for so long as two years. The rebellion, however, when it broke out, was ushered in by dramatic incidents. The King was engaged in celebrating, by a banquet to the British representative, the opening of his realm to Western commerce when the tumult began. As China and Japan had arranged their opposing claims to the suzerainty of the island, and as troops from both empires

represented their common desire to uphold the throne, the maintenance of tranquillity was expected for a time. During the banquet, however (December 4), there was an alarm of fire near the palace, and the Queen's nephew, who had recently been travelling in Europe, rushed out, was met by a body of natives, who stabbed him and his immediate attendants on the spot. With apparently little opposition, they pursued their work of murder and destruction throughout the night, the Queen and six of her ministers being murdered, besides many others. The King was next threatened, but his Japanese guards, who, it was said, detained him against his will, protected him from the fury of the Corean mob. Two days later affairs assumed a different hue; the Chinese troops siding with the Coreans, the royal palace was attacked, and a fight took place, in which the Japanese were overpowered, and took refuge in the Japanese Legation, whilst the King was carried off by the Chinese. The tumult increased, and 30 Japanese residents were massacred by the Chinese. The mob then (December 7) attacked and destroyed the Japanese Legation, but the Minister with his guard forced his way out through showers of missiles, stormed the gates, and retreated to the post of Chemulpo. The situation was critical, each side accusing the other of aggression, but it was expected the affair would be settled amicably. China had perceived after the Kuldja scare, a few years ago, the supreme strategic importance of the Corean peninsula, and that a great Power occupying it would control Chinese external policy. As the Russian press at this juncture loudly advocated the annexation of the Corea to Russian possessions on account of its proximity and its importance to Russia as an open winter port on the Pacific coast, China and Japan were equally on the alert to supply no pretext for such an act of aggression, and each Power accordingly appointed an officer to investigate the facts before deciding on any definite course. Earlier in the year Russia had concluded a commercial treaty with Corea, with the view of establishing closer durable relations with that country.

CHAPTER VI.

AFRICA.

SOUTH AFRICA—EGYPT—THE CONGO AND MADAGASCAR.

I. SOUTH AFRICA.

Cape Colony.—The opening of the year found the Cape Premier, Mr. Scanlan, in London, in negotiation with Lord Derby respecting the Cape loan and the Basuto question, and it was arranged that Col. Clarke, R.E., should go as Resident British Commissioner in Basutoland, pending a final settlement of the

matter at issue. Mr. Scanlan thereupon returned to the Cape, and was followed at once by Sir Hercules Robinson, the Governor, who was understood to have received instructions which would prove satisfactory to the Cape Parliament, and pave the way for the pacification of Bechuanaland. In Pondoland, also, matters were looking bright; but whilst Umquikela professed friendliness, he obstinately refused to recognise the appointment of the British Resident at St. John's.

Sir H. Robinson, on opening (May 2) the first session of the Seventh Cape Parliament, announced a deficit in the Budget, and said it was proposed to meet this by an increase of taxation, a revision of the Customs' tariff, and an addition to the Excise duties on spirits. He also stated that the Legislature would be asked to authorise an application to the Imperial Government, to ascertain on what terms the latter would assume control over the Transkei territory. This programme, however, was not to be carried out by Mr. Scanlan, for on their proposal to remove the existing restrictions on the importation of plants, flowers, and bulbs, the Government were defeated (May 6) by 47 votes to 10. The opposition to the proposal was founded on the fear that it might be the means of introducing the phylloxera into the colony. Mr. Scanlan announced that he regarded the result of the division as a direct vote of censure, and on the following day his Ministry resigned, and Mr. Upington was charged with forming a new Cabinet. During the short session which followed no important legislation was attempted, and Parliament was prorogued (July 19) after passing the necessary fiscal measures, including an export duty of 100*l.* a head on ostriches. The requirements of the Government were met by large increases of the Customs' tariff, and slight additions to the Excise duties. The visit of the Premier and Mr. Sprigg to Bechuanaland (November), with a view of effecting a peaceful settlement of existing difficulties, was a matter of deeper importance. The Commissioners visited in succession Vryburg, Kunana (Moshette's village), and Rooi Grond, and at the last-named place Mr. Upington declared himself the leader of the Dutch party, and said he had been selected for that post because his motto was known to be "South Africa for the South Africans." He warmly eulogised the Goshenites, and considered them a "well-informed, intelligent, respectable, and well-conducted" community! The tone and general tenour of this address caused great indignation in Cape Town, and were strongly censured by the press, including the Government organs. Meetings were held throughout the Colony to express disapproval at this interference by the Ministry in the arrangements of Bechuanaland and elsewhere in the absence of the representative of the Imperial Government. On the return of Mr. Upington and Mr. Sprigg from Goshen to Cape Town, they everywhere met with a cold reception. Sir Charles Warren, on the other hand, on his arrival in Cape Town (December 4), as commander of

the "Bechuanaland Expedition," was received with the greatest enthusiasm.

In the northern districts, at the Kimberley diamond fields, disturbances had taken place at the end of April in consequence of the "searching" regulations. The *employés* of four of the principal mines struck work, and ultimately (April 29) a serious riot took place, in which the leader was shot dead, together with five other white men, and many others seriously wounded. Business was suspended, 4,000 strikers parading the streets with the corpse of their leader. A week later, affairs quieted down, and the men resumed work; still it was judged advisable to despatch a considerable body of Colonial troops to Kimberley. The efforts of the authorities, however, to suppress the illicit diamond traffic were not altogether successful, and it was estimated that the value of diamonds stolen and disposed of amounted to about 1,000,000*l.* per annum. In the mining districts, to which alone the Search Act of 1882 had been applied, the illicit sale almost ceased, only to reappear, however, in districts where the Act was inoperative.

Basutoland.—It had been settled towards the end of 1883 that the administration of Basutoland should be transferred from the Colonial to the Imperial Government; but a prolonged interval was allowed to pass before any active steps were taken. The delay had a most injurious effect, and encouraged Masupha and others to assume a defiant attitude. This chief had all along refused to recognise Imperial rule in Basutoland or pay the hut tax, and the inaction of the authorities tempted him to renew his disturbances, so that the Leribe district was constantly in a state of ferment and disorder. In the middle of January, the President of the Orange Free State telegraphed to the High Commissioner at Cape Town that fighting on the frontier was imminent, and asked him to take steps to prevent it. The cause of the threatened outbreak was supposed to be an attempt on the part of Masupha, Joel, and others to destroy the chief Jonathan before the Imperial Government assumed complete control in Basutoland. They reckoned on the assistance of Letsea's sons, but fortunately these chiefs remained quiet; the plan failed, and the tribesmen again dispersed. A letter from forty loyal Basutos expressing their thankfulness to Her Majesty's Government for resuming the direct control of Basutoland was followed by one in a similar tone from Letsea, the paramount chief of Basutoland. To these Lord Derby replied that Her Majesty trusted to their loyalty and devotion to insure the success of the new administration. Captain Blyth, the Acting Governor's agent, however, was not thrown off his guard by Letsea's protestations. He had, it was true, always professed loyalty to the British; but he had never done anything to restrain Masupha, and Captain Blyth suspected an understanding between the two chiefs. Moreover, Letsea's two sons, Lerothodi and Theko, went about declaring that their father was bringing the tribe to destruction by neglecting his duties as

paramount chief of the country, and by allowing it to continue in such an unsettled state. The order in Council having arrived from England, the High Commissioner at Cape Town issued (March 18) his Proclamation, announcing that the Queen had given her consent to the Disannexation Act, and the same day Colonel Clarke arrived at Maseru (in Basutoland), and as Resident Commissioner published it there. Letsea and his followers escorted him to the Residency and remained for the night. The next day a pitso was held, at which Letsea and a large number of chiefs and leaders were present, besides 2,000 of the people, and a generally friendly feeling was manifest. Masupha, of course, was not represented. At this juncture, however, Letsika and some Basutos crossed the Caledon into the Orange Free State, taking with them the cattle they had captured in Basutoland. The President of that State at once telegraphed to the High Commissioner at Cape Town, requesting him to put a stop to the Basutos crossing into his territory with captured cattle, adding that he should be reluctant to have recourse to force. This remonstrance, and the renewal of disturbances between Jonathan and Joel, caused Colonel Clarke to take prompt steps for restoring order. Learning that Jonathan was closely besieged by his brother Joel and the sons of Masupha, and that the Basutos were collecting from all parts of the country to share in the division of the spoil, Colonel Clarke sent a peremptory order to Letsea, to direct the withdrawal of all strangers from the Leribe district, and to bring about a cessation of hostilities between the two brothers. The command was at once obeyed, Jonathan and Joel sent in messages of submission, and Colonel Clarke referred the subject of their quarrel to Letsea for decision. Colonel Clarke further directed inquiries to be made into the condition of the Basuto women driven across the Caledon, and finding them almost destitute of clothing, supplied them with blankets, on the understanding that they would recross the river as soon as it was safe to do so. Scarcely a month, however, had elapsed when the quarrel between Jonathan and Joel threatened to break out again. On receiving the news Colonel Clarke set out for Leribe, procured Letsea's decision as to the previous quarrel, summoned the brothers, and made their representatives ride along the newly-fixed boundary line in his company. He next started for the frontier, and, having ascertained the whereabouts of Letsika, made Lerothodi adjudicate on the former's dispute with Matela, and, supported by President Brand's threat of force, at length cleared the Free State Territory of Basuto trespassers.

Sir Hercules Robinson lost no time in issuing a Proclamation (May 29), in which were explained the amended Regulations for the government of Basutoland, and assimilating the laws as far as possible to those of Cape Colony. And at a later date (June 25) a second Proclamation defined the conditions upon which persons not domiciled in Basutoland would be permitted to enter that terri-

tory. The Mounted Police Force, organised during the summer for the defence of the Basuto border, as now defined, consisted of 2 inspectors, 7 sub-inspectors, 1 medical officer, 10 European constables, 4 native officers, and 136 non-commissioned officers and privates, for which the estimated annual cost was about 11,000*l*. The in-inefficiency of this force was soon to be made manifest. On the rumour of disturbances beyond the frontier, President Brand telegraphed (July 15) to Sir H. Robinson that the state of affairs in Basutoland was very unsettled, and that he had made preparations to resist any raids into the Orange Free State, and to check any disturbance which might arise out of the annexation to the Orange Free State of the Barolong territory. On this point President Brand informed Sir H. Robinson that the chief Sepinare had been treacherously murdered, and that in view of the public interest, and to establish law and order, he had taken the step of annexing the disturbed district to the Orange Free State. No sooner was this done than the chief Letsea put forward a claim to the territory in question. This Sir H. Robinson refused to consider, holding President Brand's action to have been justifiable, and in this decision Lord Derby acquiesced. Colonel Clarke next held (September 3) a pitso to settle the claims put forward by Letsea and others to the district of Quithing. This county he declared to be a portion of Basutoland, from which the inhabitants could not isolate themselves, but must live peaceably with their brethren. Thanks to the tact and firmness displayed by Colonel Clarke, before the close of the year the border disturbances had almost disappeared; and though President Brand had been nervously apprehensive of raids into his territory, and although it seemed as if the new police force would be insufficient to maintain order should serious troubles break out, it was obvious that the authority of the Queen's Government would be more and more readily recognised. President Brand, when urging Colonel Clarke to preserve peace on the border and increase the police force, had conveniently forgotten that the Treaty of Aliwal imposed an equal obligation on the part of the Orange Free Territory to keep order, and also that during the Leribe disturbances he had refused permission to Colonel Clarke's officers to follow and arrest offenders in the Free State Territory. The estimated revenue for the year to June 30, 1885, was set down at 20,950*l*., including a Colonial contribution of 20,000*l*.; while the estimated expenditure was 19,371*l*. 10*s*., of which 9,816*l*. appeared under the head of police. Colonel Clarke estimated the local sources of revenue would produce 12,000*l*. during the next financial year.

Bechuanaland.—The question of amending the Pretoria Convention of 1881 was under discussion early in the year between the British Government and three delegates from the Transvaal, Messrs. Krüger, Smit, and Du Toit, and the result of frequent discussions was embodied in a new convention, signed in London (February 27), and ratified by the Volksraad in the following

August. It contained altogether twenty articles, of which the first two settled the boundary questions. The Transvaal was extended on the south-west so as to include certain territories, the chiefs of which were friendly to the Boers, and were believed to desire their rule; but the principal trade route to the North, through Bechuanaland, fell outside in spite of the efforts of the delegates to secure it for their countrymen. The new boundary line was to be marked off by a joint Commission, and disputed sites were to be referred to an arbitrator appointed by the President of the Orange Free State. In two other articles, provision was made for the appointment of a British officer to reside in the Transvaal, with duties "analogous to those of a Consular officer," and for limiting the control by Great Britain of foreign relations of the Republic to the right of vetoing treaties with any civilised power other than the Orange Free State, or any native power. The debt due from the Transvaal to the British Government was also reduced from 380,000*l.* to 250,000*l.*, and was to be paid off in twenty-five years.

The negotiations by the three delegates elsewhere were not so successful. At Brussels, Amsterdam, Paris, they attempted in vain to raise a loan of 15,000,000 florins for the construction of railways. But in Lisbon they at length were able to make arrangements for laying a railroad from Delagoa Bay to Pretoria. The delegates thus did not return home without having obtained several important modifications of the Pretoria Convention in favour of the Transvaal—henceforward to be known as the South African Republic—nor without warm expressions of sympathy from Germany and the Netherlands. They had, however, failed to induce the British Government to give up the Bechuanas, who claimed to be our allies, and whose cause was warmly espoused both in Parliament and in the Press. After some delay, the Colonial Office consented to the establishment of a British Protectorate over Bechuanaland, and an excellent choice was made in the nomination of the Rev. John Mackenzie to be British Resident, under Sir H. Robinson, the Governor of Cape Colony. The Boers replied by declaring war against the chief, Montsioa, whose rights had been specially reserved, and compelled him to accept a treaty which virtually placed his lands at their disposal. British authority was ostentatiously ignored, lawless bands harassed the country, and Mr. Bethell, an English gentleman, acting as agent for one of the Bechuana chiefs, was brutally murdered. The Boers had therefore to be taught that the terms of the Convention would be enforced, if necessary by arms, and the task of restoring order in Bechuanaland and of protecting Montsioa was forthwith undertaken. A vote of three-quarters of a million was granted by the British Parliament in November for the expenses of an expedition, which was placed under the command of Sir Charles Warren, with full powers both military and political. The proposal to place Bechuanaland under the Cape Government ap-

peared to be open to question when it was seen that a powerful party among the Colonists, including the Premier, sympathised with the Boers.

It is not possible within our limits to do more than summarise the principal events of Mr. Mackenzie's short tenure of office (April to August). In little more than four months he had travelled over the whole of Bechuanaland south of the Molopo river, and entered into treaties with Mankoroane, Montsioa, and other chiefs. He was welcomed everywhere by the Bechuanas, who accepted the Protectorate, and expressed their willingness to pay taxes to the Queen. "The Queen's government is undoubtedly the best," said a white-headed councillor to Mr. Mackenzie at one of the kraals. "It has only one fault; it always goes away, and goes away when we wish it to remain. We trust you will remain this time." The jealousy, however, of the white men located in Bechuanaland at length rendered his position untenable, but no charge was preferred against him. In tendering his resignation, Mr. Mackenzie stated his belief that he had succeeded in Bechuanaland and Stellaland; whilst the attitude of the Transvaal to the Protectorate did not affect him as Deputy-Commissioner, but was a question for the consideration of the High Commissioner and Her Majesty's Government. Mr. Rhodes succeeded Mr. Mackenzie in August as Special Commissioner, and Mr. Van Niekerk became Assistant Commissioner; but they fared no better than their predecessor in maintaining order, and the Boers continued their cattle-stealing and land-grabbing with impunity throughout the autumn.

The intimation (October 8) that the British Government disapproved of the Boer Protectorate over territory declared to be under British protection might under other circumstances have been treated with indifference. Sir Charles Warren was, however, already expected, bringing with him an imposing display of British troops, and the Boers forthwith announced their readiness to come to terms.

The Cape Premier left Kimberley (November 9) for Bechuanaland, where President Krüger met him, in order if possible to bring about a peaceful solution of the situation, and four weeks later the following terms were agreed upon, and approved (December 5) by Her Majesty's Government: viz. (1) Montsioa was to be replaced in occupation of the garden ground and grazing lands of which the chief and his tribe were in undisturbed possession in May, 1884, when formally taken under British protection; (2) the claims of the freebooters to land in Montsioa's country were not to be recognised, but the Imperial Government declined to contribute to the expenditure of those who had infringed the British Protectorate; and (3), until the Cape Ministry were authorised by their Parliament to take over the country, Her Majesty's Government would retain the administration of the Protectorate in their own hands, and Sir C. Warren would occupy the country with an adequate force.

Natal and Zululand.—The uncertainty that prevailed at the close of 1883 as to how Cetywayo was to be disposed of was set at rest by his sudden death (February 9). A fortnight before his death he, with a number of his followers, had surreptitiously left Ekowe, where he had been living under British protection, but he was pursued by the military, captured, and brought back to Ekowe. In spite of the disasters of the previous year, he still nourished a hope of regaining his throne, but the closeness with which his movements were watched in the Reserve Territory rendered him desperate. His death, however, did not bring peace to the district. Usibepu having gained a victory over the Usutus in January, retired to his own territory, but almost immediately after Cetywayo's death hostilities were renewed between the contending tribes. Outside the Reserve Territory, in view of the declaration that the British authorities would not interfere on either side, the Usutus invoked the assistance of the Transvaal Boers, by whose aid they defeated Usibepu. The Boers installed (May 21) Dinizulu, son of Cetywayo, as King of Zululand; the ceremony took place at a laager near the Ingome Forest; about 7,000 Zulus were present, and the king was attended by four of his uncles. Oham, Usibepu, and Umnyamona excused themselves, but sent representatives authorised to acknowledge the king on their behalf, on condition that the first two were allowed to retain their independence. Dirk Uys, the Boer chairman, standing with Dinizulu under a blue and white flag, resembling that used when the Boers crowned Panda forty-four years before, announced that they had resolved to terminate the shedding of blood by establishing and upholding in authority Panda's lineal successor. A general amnesty was also proclaimed, and the people were ordered to bury their spears and live in peace.

For some weeks prior to the coronation great excitement had been caused by the action of the Boers, several hundreds of whom settled in Central Zululand, announcing their intention of remaining there unless England annexed the country. They said the present condition of anarchy on the border was intolerable, and that they had no idea of interfering with the Reserve or Usibepu. This step on the part of the Boers greatly encouraged the Usutus in their defiant attitude towards the British, and several outbreaks occurred. The situation grew critical, and Mr. Osborn, the British Resident, was obliged to make a strong appeal for help to John Dunn. The Usutus assembled on the frontier, and announced their intention to include Natal in the sphere of their hostile operations. The state of affairs was so bad that it behoved the British Government either to extend their authority over the disturbed district or to retire from the country at once. A detachment of 150 regular troops was ordered to march from Ekowe to support Mr. Osborn to maintain the integrity of the Reserve Territory. This decision produced lively satisfaction among the Zulus, and did much to restore confidence, whilst it also checked

the hostile manifestations of the Usutus. A request by the Natal Government for an additional English regiment was refused by the Home Government, but a strong detachment of troops was entrenched between Ekowe and Inkankhla, and John Dunn took the field with a large force. The Usutus, under Dabulamanzi, attacked (June 1) the loyal chief Umbusa in the Reserve Territory, but were defeated. The Boers next invaded Usibepu's territory, aided by a strong Usutu impi, and penetrated to a point twelve miles from the chief kraal; and a force consisting of 500 Boers and several thousand Usutus advanced (June 8) against Usibepu. The latter, though outnumbered, dashed gallantly against the Usutus, who wavered, broke, and would have fled, had not the Boers galloped up in force and poured in a heavy fire upon Usibepu's men, of whom 600 fell. His kraals were also burnt, and his cattle captured; he himself with two English companions retreated first up the Bomba Mountains to his stronghold, and thence, four days later, to Ekowe. The situation was now very serious, for it was felt that the Usutus, emboldened by their Boer alliance and their recent success, might either attack the Reserve Territory or turn upon John Dunn. A troop of the 6th Inniskilling Dragoons was ordered to Ekowe from Durban, and the second battalion of the Northamptonshire Regiment from Cape Town to Natal, whilst additional precautions were taken at Ekowe and other parts of the Reserve. Early in July a military column of 400 men, supported by 2,000 of John Dunn's natives, left Ekowe for a reconnaissance. The Usutus often crossed the border for raiding, but contrived to evade the troops by passing round them; and towards the end of August a proclamation was issued at Pretoria, and signed by King Dinizulu, announcing the establishment of a Boer Republic in Zululand, declaring the latter to be under the protectorate of the New Republic, and calling upon Usibepu to submit. For some months no change occurred in the position, but early in December three delegates from the new Boer Republic arrived in Pietermaritzburg to confer with Sir Henry Bulwer. The proceedings were private, but the delegates were told their reception must not be regarded as any recognition of the claim of the new Republic to be considered an independent State, but merely a readiness to receive any communication for submission to the British Government. Meanwhile, Dinizulu and the Usutus began to look with distrust on the land claims and political pretensions of the Boers, and very shortly after they fell out themselves over the question of land concessions. No outbreak occurred before the close of the year, but the situation remained serious and perplexing.

The Legislative Council was opened on June 18, and the absence of any reference to Zululand in the Governor's speech caused much comment. He stated that taxation bills of various kinds, including increased Custom duties, would be introduced. The budget in July showed a deficit of 127,475*l.*, and extra taxation

measures were therefore proposed, including the raising of the duty on coffee to 2s. per 100 lbs., and that on spirits to 3s. a gallon.

Some excitement was caused both in England and Germany as the year was closing by the announcement that Sir Henry Bulwer had hoisted the British flag over the Bay of St. Lucia, on the coast of Zululand. This was done in consequence of rumours that the German Government were meditating a similar step on behalf of Germany, and it was thought advisable by the Natal authorities to anticipate such a step, and to obtain the subsequent approval of the British Government. The German claim was that on November 13 a certain Herr Lüderitz, of Bremen, had acquired from Dinizulu St. Lucia Bay, together with 100,000 acres of adjoining land. The British claim, however, was a far stronger one, for as long ago as 1834 the Bay of St. Lucia had been ceded to England by Panda, King of the Zulus. The bay included the mouth of the river Umvoloozi and the adjacent shore. In the face of this, Germany refrained from moving in the matter, and it was a general matter of congratulation that the Natal Government had by their promptitude averted a grave danger to their revenue and a probable increase of political troubles.

II. EGYPT.

The opening of the year found the Egyptian Ministry greatly troubled by the condition of the Soudan, where the tide of insurrection was rising so rapidly as not only to threaten the complete overthrow of the Khedive's authority in that region, but also to become a serious menace to Egypt itself. The victories of the Mahdi and his lieutenants during the previous year had greatly raised his reputation as a prophet, and had increased very considerably the number of his adherents. The advice of the British Government to relieve the invested garrisons, and retire from the country as quickly as possible, was considered at several councils of the Egyptian Ministry during the first week in January, and a partial compliance was resolved upon. In a note sent to the British Government the Ministers offered to resign all claims upon Darfour, Kordofan, and the other provinces actually lost, but they strongly objected to retire from Khartoum, and announced their intention of offering the Eastern Soudan to the Sultan. This brought a further message from the British Government, couched in more peremptory language, requiring the withdrawal of all the Egyptian forces to within a line drawn at Wady Halfa (the second cataract), and their concentration for its defence, the assistance of British troops being promised should the invasion of this line be threatened. As to the Eastern Soudan, no objection was offered to its cession to Turkey, but it was stipulated that no part of the expense necessary for taking possession should be laid upon Egypt. The receipt of this message led to the resignation of Sherif Pasha's Ministry (January 6), and a new Cabinet under Nubar Pasha was

constituted, Mustapha Pasha Fehmi becoming Minister of Finance, and Abdurrahman Rushdi Minister of Public Works. Within a few days of this event a message was received from Colonel Coetlogon, who had been sent to Khartoum, imploring the Government, in view of the impossibility of relieving the garrison, to give orders for its retreat. He stated that one-third of the troops were disaffected, that the population were at enmity with the soldiers, and that unless a movement was quickly made it would soon become impossible. In answer to this message the Egyptian Government telegraphed instructions ordering all the troops in the Soudan to be collected, Khartoum to be evacuated, and the stores destroyed. The British Government were apprised of this step, and at the same time the difficulties attendant upon its fulfilment were pointed out. The civil Egyptian and Christian population of Khartoum were said to amount to about 11,000 persons, and as the journey would have to be made by the river, their removal could only be effected after extensive preparations had been made, which would occupy several months. In view of these difficulties the British Government applied to General "Chinese" Gordon, who had formerly been Governor-General of the Soudan under Ismail, and invited him to proceed to Khartoum to assist in the evacuation. The General, who was just on the point of starting for the Congo in the service of the King of the Belgians, readily accepted the task, and at once started for Cairo, accompanied by Colonel Stewart, a cavalry officer who had been engaged in 1883 on a temporary mission to the Soudan. He reached Cairo January 24, and after interviews with Sir Evelyn Baring and the Khedive (the latter of whom conferred upon him his former title of Governor-General of the Soudan), and placed 100,000*E.L.* at his disposal, he started (January 26) for Khartoum, declining all escort, and travelling by the quickest route. Before starting he despatched a characteristic telegram to the garrison—"You are men, not women. Be not afraid. I am coming."

During January Baker Pasha had been compelled to remain inactive at Souakim on account of the non-arrival of the reinforcements promised him, but towards the end of the month the greater portion of them arrived, and he received orders to advance. The object of his expedition was to relieve the garrisons of Sinkat and Tokar, after which these places were to be abandoned, and the whole of the forces were to retire upon Souakim. To accomplish this he had a force of rather over 3,500 partially untrained soldiers, four guns, and two Gatlings. This expeditionary force was conveyed by sea to Trinkitat, a small port on the coast, about twenty-five miles south of Souakim, and about twenty miles from Tokar. Here a temporary entrenched camp had been formed, and the expedition set out (February 11) for the relief of Tokar, the cavalry being scattered around the column as skirmishers, and the guns placed in advance. For a few miles the march was unmolested, but when the column neared some rough and broken ground a few

miles inland the Arabs, who had been lying concealed in the nullahs, suddenly showed themselves, and attacked the cavalry skirmishers, who at once turned and fled. The infantry had been ordered on the appearance of the enemy to form square to receive them, and desperate efforts were made by the European officers in charge to get them into this formation, but with only partial success. Three sides were roughly formed, but on the fourth the men were too panic-stricken to do anything, and stood huddled together like a flock of sheep. A little wild firing on the part of those who were in formation ensued, but as soon as the Arabs came to close quarters the men flung down their weapons and fled. In eight minutes from the opening of the attack the whole Egyptian army was in hopeless flight, and the Arabs rushing in amongst the fugitives speared them or cut their throats without meeting any resistance, the Egyptians merely kneeling down to implore the mercy which was never granted. The European company was almost entirely cut off, the English officers Morice Bey, Dr. Leslie, Captains Forrester Walker, Carroll, Smith, and Watkins, with ten other foreign officers, were killed; the four guns and two Gatlings remained in the hands of the Arabs, and over 2,200 of the Egyptians were left on the field. The pursuit ceased when the entrenched camp at Trinkitat was reached, and the remnants of the force, with such of the European officers as had escaped, were at once embarked for Souakim. This defeat was followed within a few days by the fall of Sinkat, the garrison of which, under the brave Tewfik Pasha, sallied out in the hope of being able to cut their way through to the coast, but were surrounded and destroyed. A few days later the garrison of Tokar, having made terms with the Arabs, surrendered. It was now evident that the Egyptian troops were totally unable to cope with the Arabs, and that the port of Souakim was in imminent danger of falling into the hands of Osman Digna, representing the Mahdi. In view of the probable spread of the insurrection and consequent religious disturbance in Arabia, the British Government at once decided to undertake the defence of Souakim. By the end of February a force amounting to about 3,000 infantry, 750 cavalry and mounted infantry, 115 men from the Naval Brigade, and about 200 artillerymen and engineers, was assembled under the command of General Graham. It was understood that the Arabs held a strong position at the village of Teb, a few miles inland from Trinkitat. The British column set out from the camp at the latter place, known as Fort Baker (February 29) on a march inland along a road almost identical with that previously followed by Baker Pasha. On arriving within sight of the village of Teb it was found that the Arabs had entrenched themselves with care, and had mounted the captured Egyptian guns. The rear of their position, however, was comparatively unprotected, and General Graham decided to attack on that side. The village having been vigorously shelled by the 7lb. naval guns, the troops moved in the

square formation towards the Arab lines. The Arabs, who had hitherto carefully concealed themselves in the brushwood and shelter trenches, suddenly jumped up on all sides, and with a wild rush attacked the square on three of its sides with the most desperate fanaticism, but instead of the confusion and flight which had followed their attack on Baker Pasha's troops, they encountered a deadly hail of bullets which swept them down by hundreds, while the few who succeeded in getting to close quarters were quickly bayoneted. The square steadily advanced, firing as it moved, until the whole Arab position was carried. It then became the work of the cavalry to engage the sullenly retiring Arabs, but owing to the broken nature of the ground, the wonderful activity of the Arabs, and the unsuitability of the sabre for this kind of warfare, our troops suffered heavily both in officers and men. The total British loss was four officers and twenty-six non-commissioned officers and men killed, twenty-two officers and about 120 men being wounded; the Arab loss being roughly estimated at about 1,500 in killed and wounded. After the battle the British soldiers bivouacked around the wells at Teb, and on the following day advanced to Tokar, which was entered without further opposition, and after burning the village the troops returned to Souakim. It had been hoped that this defeat would have broken up the confederacy of the Arabs, and a proclamation was sent to the different sheikhs inviting them to come in and make terms; but defiant answers only were received, and General Graham learnt that a strong force of Arabs remained assembled at Tamai, a place about sixteen miles to the south-west of Souakim. It was thereupon determined to break up this encampment also, and in the middle of the night the infantry marched out (March 11) from Souakim, and established themselves in a small entrenched camp a few miles inland. The next day they were joined by the cavalry, and a further stage of the journey was accomplished, the troops bivouacking about a mile and a half from the enemy's position. The Arabs maintained a desultory fire throughout the night without doing much harm, and in the morning (March 13) the British force moved out and commenced the attack. The infantry were divided into two brigades, the first under General Sir Redvers Buller, consisting of the men from the Gordon Highlanders, Royal Irish Fusiliers, and King's Rifles regiments; the second, under General Davis, composed of the Black Watch, the York and Lancaster regiments, the 65th, and the Marines. The brigades drawn up in square, General Davis leading, moved towards the valley where the Arabs lay concealed. The front face, however, having advanced too rapidly, became separated from the main body, whereupon the Arabs suddenly rushed into the gap thus made, and desperate hand-to-hand fighting ensued. The fury of the Arabs seemed to render them insensible to the fear of death, and they flung themselves upon the square with such determined valour, that but for the obstinate courage displayed by both officers and men, the charge

might have ended disastrously for the British forces. As it was, the leading square was driven back level with the second before it recovered its formation, and the machine guns were left for a time in the hands of the enemy. The second square had meanwhile been assailed on all sides, but owing to the wider space which the enemy had to traverse, and the steady firing of the men, the Arabs were checked before getting within striking distance. This stopped their onslaught, and a sustained fire from the carbines of the dismounted cavalry enabled both squares of the infantry to close up and advance, recovering the machine guns, and driving the Arabs before them into the nullah from which they had at first emerged. This was soon cleared, and the village at Tamai was occupied. The huts of the village and the stores taken from the Egyptians accumulated there were burned, and the next day the remainder of Osman Digna's camp was given to the flames. This work accomplished, the troops returned by easy marches to Souakim, having lost seven officers and nearly one hundred men killed, the wounded, owing to the nature of the fighting, being only about half that number. The Arab loss was estimated at about 3,000. After these victories a suggestion that a force of British troops should advance from Souakim to Berber, so as to open up a retreat for the Egyptian garrisons, was considered by the authorities, but was dismissed as impracticable; and after a third march inland, which was almost unopposed, and resulted in the destruction of the village of Tamanieb, the greater portion of the troops were withdrawn from Souakim. A small force, however, was left in garrison there, to act in concert with the naval commander in the Red Sea, and, with the exception of occasional skirmishes and outpost engagements, Souakim remained undisturbed throughout the remainder of the year.

In the month of April Admiral Hewett was sent on a mission to King John, the chief ruler of Abyssinia, and with some difficulty succeeded in reaching that monarch and negotiating a treaty with him. By the terms of this treaty the King of Abyssinia bound himself, in return for the cession of the Boghos country, and the free transit of goods through Massowah, to remain on friendly terms with the Egyptians, and to undertake the relief of the garrisons of Kassala, Gelahat, Gedari, and Girah. The former portion of the compact was carried out, for Abyssinia gave no trouble throughout the remainder of the year, but nothing was accomplished by the Abyssinians towards the relief of the beleaguered garrisons.

Meantime the news received from the interior of the Soudan was of a more discouraging character. General Gordon, accompanied by Colonel Stewart, had reached Khartoum safely (February 18), his arrival being hailed with intense enthusiasm by the inhabitants and the garrison, all of whom assembled to welcome him, hundreds pressing upon him to kiss his hands and his feet. He at once issued a proclamation recognising the Mahdi as ruler

of Kordofan, remitting half the taxes, and permitting the holding of slaves. The latter part of the proclamation excited considerable surprise in England, but the General subsequently explained that domestic slavery had never been prohibited, and that it was slave hunting he had formerly endeavoured to suppress, and which he would still oppose by all means in his power. He soon telegraphed to Cairo, asking for Zebehr Pasha, whose co-operation in uniting the local tribes against the Mahdi, and establishing a settled form of government after the withdrawal of the Egyptians, he declared would be invaluable. To this request, in spite of its support by Sir Evelyn Baring, the British Government refused consent, and at a later period, when it seemed likely that Zebehr would start on his own account, instructed the Egyptian authorities to detain him. At Khartoum, Gordon found the influence of the Mahdi was extending among the surrounding tribes, and that he would have to contend against treachery from within as well as assaults from without. In one of his earliest engagements two Egyptian commanders, Said and Hassan Pasha, turned traitors, and attacked their own men. They, nevertheless, had the hardihood to return to Khartoum, where they were promptly arrested by Gordon, tried by court-martial, and executed. The "insurgent" or Mahdi's troops lost no time in parley, and at once commenced (March 23) firing into the city; and Gordon having found his troops useless or untrustworthy, was compelled to act only on the defensive. In the defence, however, he displayed the utmost vigour and inexhaustible resource. Within a few weeks he extended the limits of the fortifications so as to guarantee the city from a sudden surprise, and round the outer works broken glass, wire nettings, and percussion mines were thickly strewn. The steamers he found at Khartoum he made bullet-proof by means of planks of wood and some old boiler-plates; and he converted some barges into gunboats, arming them with mountain guns, with which he was able to bombard the Arab camps on either bank of the river. In spite of these efforts the tribes above Khartoum continued to declare against the Egyptian Government, and before long Berber was surrounded, and communication with it rendered very precarious. From time to time earnest appeals for assistance reached the Egyptian and British authorities from this place, but, according to the opinion of military experts, no effective aid could be rendered to the beleaguered garrison in less time than two months by the quickest route, or in less than four months by the river. Accordingly, Hassan Khalifa, the commander of Berber, was informed that no immediate assistance could be given him, and the Arabs pressing the siege more energetically, the city surrendered before the end of May; and although conflicting statements were afterwards received as to the details of its fall, all accounts agreed in saying that it was attended by considerable loss of life. The fall of Berber, moreover, added considerably to General Gordon's difficulties, who in an indignant despatch appealed from the Govern-

ment to the "millionaires of England and America" for sufficient money to raise a force of 2,000 or 3,000 Turkish Nizams, which he said would be sufficient to settle affairs at Khartoum, and cause the collapse of the Mahdi. To this Earl Granville replied that it was not the purpose of the British Government to supply any Turkish or other force for the purpose of undertaking military expeditions; and further he reminded General Gordon of the pacific nature of the mission entrusted to him. This reply was despatched at the end of April, but by this time Khartoum had become so closely besieged that communication was almost impossible, and soon afterwards the curtain fell, and except through vague and often contradictory native reports, the condition of Khartoum for months remained unknown.

In Lower Egypt, the new administration formed at the commencement of the year appeared to be making satisfactory progress, and the English officials were able to accomplish much good work in the way of internal reform. Some friction, however, arose early in the year between Nubar Pasha and Mr. Clifford Lloyd, and though matters were arranged for a time, it was found in the end that Mr. Lloyd was unable to work harmoniously with the Egyptian ministers, and Nubar Pasha, by a threat of resignation, procured his dismissal from office. On his return to England Mr. Lloyd published in the *Times* an account of the condition of the Egyptian prisons, showing that they were used for purposes of extortion and private vengeance, and that the unhappy prisoners were treated with the greatest cruelty and injustice. In the beginning of March the Indemnity Commission, appointed to investigate claims for property destroyed in the burning of Alexandria, closed its sittings after dealing with a total of nearly 10,000 claims, and as the liability admitted amounted to 4,250,000*l.*, the arrangement of the Egyptian finances now became a matter of paramount importance. The British Government ordered a report on the state of the finances, and a statement of the results of the administration subsequent to the settlement by the Commission of Liquidation in 1880 to be drawn up. This financial statement was sent (April 22) to the Great Powers, with a circular despatch inviting them to a Conference in London for the purpose of arranging the financial system of Egypt, and making the necessary provision for present and future needs. The receipt of this despatch at Paris afforded the French Government an opportunity of breaking the dignified silence it had maintained since the abolition of the Dual Control, and in proof of its good-will towards England the French Government announced that the abolition of the Dual Control would be no longer contested, and the British Government was invited to give an explanation of its plans concerning the pacification and future government of Egypt.

The Conference, as detailed elsewhere, separated without coming to an understanding; and although its failure was resented by the French press, in England it was felt that the

British Government had recovered its freedom of action; and this feeling of satisfaction was increased when a few days later (August 5) it was announced that the Cabinet had resolved to send Lord Northbrook to Egypt as High Commissioner, to inquire into its finances and condition, and to report to his colleagues. Soon after his arrival at Cairo the Egyptian Government, with the approval of the British Ministry, took the important step of temporarily suspending the funding of the sums specially assigned for the redemption of the public debt, and of applying the money to meet the pressing needs of the administration. This action was at once met by a protest on the part of the diplomatic representatives of Germany, France, Austria, and Russia, and the Commissioners of the Public Debt soon afterwards commenced proceedings before the International Tribunals against the Egyptian Government. The funding, after an interval of six weeks, was resumed, but the suit was persisted in, and a verdict against the Government was obtained. Against this decision the Egyptian Government gave notice of appeal, and nothing was done towards carrying out the judgment up to the end of the year. Lord Northbrook, on his return to England, presented his plan, but its details were not made public before the close of the year.

Simultaneously with the despatch of Lord Northbrook to inquire into Egyptian finance, the Government had obtained from Parliament a credit of 300,000*l.*, in order to make "preparations, as distinct from operations," for the despatch of a possible expedition to Khartoum, and Lord Wolseley accompanied Lord Northbrook to Egypt, to examine and report as to the military situation. In a very short time it became evident that the preparations had become merged into operations; and when at the end of September public interest was aroused by the striking account of the defence of Khartoum which came to hand in the diary of Mr. Power, the correspondent of the *Times*, an expedition had already been set moving for the relief of the city. The route chosen was that of the Nile, and the preparations made were both elaborate and minute. Portable river steamers and a large fleet of whale-boats were forwarded from England, and 400 Canadian boatmen were engaged for conveying them through the rapids; reinforcements of troops were placed under orders; and when Lord Wolseley left for Wady Halfa (October 5), the whole course of the river between that place and Cairo was the scene of active life. The Mudir of Dongola, concerning whose fidelity many doubts had been entertained, now came forward with valuable offers of assistance, and rendered important aid in the accumulation of stores, the purchase of camels, and the hiring of natives to assist in towing the boats of the expedition through the cataracts.

In the early part of October the sad intelligence was received of the treacherous murder of Colonel Stewart, the aide-de-camp of General Gordon, and of Mr. Power, the special correspondent of the *Times*, on their way to Dongola. General Gordon, however, still

held out, and strenuous efforts were made by the British commanders to press forward to his assistance. These efforts were zealously supported by all who were taking part in the expedition, and by the beginning of December the advanced guard had established itself at Debbah, forty miles in advance of Dongola. By the end of the month a strong force had been assembled at Korti, where a large camp was established. From this point Lord Wolseley resolved to despatch a strong column across the desert, avoiding a wide bend of the river, and by a march of 176 miles to reach the town of Metamneh on the Nile, whence it was hoped communication could be opened up with Gordon, while the bulk of the force was slowly ascending the river. Eleven hundred men, with 1,800 camels, under Sir H. Stewart, were told off for this duty, and the column started on its march towards the Gakdul Wells on December 29.

III. THE CONGO AND MADAGASCAR.

The competition of rival explorers on the upper course of the Congo induced the British Foreign Office to recognise the obsolete claims of Portugal to the territorial possession of the lower part of the river, and a treaty embodying this recognition, with guarantees for freedom of trade, was laid before Parliament. As Germany, France, and other Powers declined to sanction it, and in the House of Commons great dissatisfaction was expressed, the treaty was never ratified; but an attempt was made by England to procure the appointment of an International Commission to control and regulate the navigation and commerce of the Congo. Nothing, however, was done until the autumn, when a Conference was convened at Berlin to consider the subject, and was still sitting when the year closed. Along the river itself, Mr. Stanley and others continued to make progress. Bólóbó, about eighty miles north of Stanley Pool, and $2\frac{1}{2}$ degrees south of the equator, was but a few years ago the most remote station on the river; but since then Lukalela, sixty miles further north, Equator Station, fifty miles more to the north-east, and a third at Stanley Falls, some 500 miles more in the interior, have been brought within European influence. By establishing a station at Stanley Falls, the American explorer crowned and completed the mission with which he had been entrusted by the King of the Belgians. Beyond Stanley Pool, the river is navigable for 300 miles to Nyangwe, the great Arab entrepôt; here the river, nearly a mile in width, divides into two streams, each navigable for another 300 miles. It was then found that the Congo had a direct navigable length up the main river of 1,060 miles, and an aggregate length of tributary rivers exceeding 3,000 miles; whilst after passing a few slight obstructions there are 2,000 additional miles, giving altogether 5,000 miles of river navigation available to commerce. The banks are inhabited by friendly natives who are

born traders, and ready to go far afield from their homes to secure a good market for their produce. Mr. Stanley gave it as his opinion that this fertile tract through which the Upper Congo flows might, if properly developed, produce a trade worth 70,000,000*l.* per annum, since the Lower Congo, with far less advantages, extending along 388 miles, already produces 2,800,000*l.* per annum. The programme of the International African Association includes no trading rights. No Customs' duties will be levied on its frontiers, individual liberty is guaranteed, and equal privileges are secured to every nationality.

On behalf of the French, however, M. de Brazza has not meanwhile been idle. At Brazzaville he concluded treaties with petty chiefs between the Congo and the Gaboon, and was busy seeking for a more direct route than that of the Alima and Ogové, between the Congo and the French possessions. He created twenty-two stations between Cape Lopez and Brazzaville, and planned ten other settlements. The Ogové was completely surveyed, as well as the country between that river and the Alima. Moreover, he established an understanding with Mr. Stanley, but so far, the French have done little or nothing for the development of the country they have taken under their protection.

Madagascar.—Early in 1884 the official correspondence between England and France on the detention of Mr. Shaw, the English missionary, was published. As soon as the French Government were satisfied that the proceedings of Admiral Pierre were wholly unjustifiable, they wrote (October, 1883) "to offer a sum of 25,000 francs as evidence of our wish to lighten the consequences of the hardships endured by Mr. Shaw." The French Government having thereby acknowledged the principle of an indemnity, the British Government accepted the sum "in the spirit in which it is tendered," and expressed their satisfaction at the settlement of the "painful question." After this, little was heard in England of what the French were doing in Madagascar. Their operations, it was reported, had been limited to bombarding half-fortified places and destroying villages along the coast, bringing ruin alike upon native towns and the factories and plantations of English settlers. The estates of the latter were "wrecked, plundered, annihilated," in spite of the appeals of their owners to the English Government for protection and redress. Shadowy negotiations were constantly going on towards the end of 1883 between the French and the Hovas, but they ended in nothing. Early in the new year the prospect of a settlement revived. The object of the French was, as explained by M. Ferry, the protection of the north-west coast, where a number of French citizens had settled, and who, it was alleged, were not treated upon the same footing as the subjects of other European nations. Certain points in the north, M. Ferry declared, would therefore be occupied, and Tamatave and Majunga would be retained. It was not intended to assume the sovereignty of the island, nor to drive the Hovas out

of it, but to make them feel the strength of France. When the tidings of the vote on the Madagascar question in the French Chamber reached Admiral Galiber, he was conferring with the Hova envoys. It was reported that he at once brought the interview to a close, saying, "It is no longer a time to negotiate; we will make war." The Hovas forthwith set about taking defensive measures, and called to their aid Colonel Willoughby, an English officer who had distinguished himself during the Zulu War, to whom was submitted the reorganisation of the Hova army. During the negotiations between Admiral Galiber and the Governor of Tamatave, the latter had positively refused to cede any of the mainland, though he had offered the islands of Nosifaly and Nosimitsin, together with an indemnity. This proposal was not accepted, and during the remainder of the year the Hovas occupied a strong position about six miles to the rear of Tamatave. Their regular troops were armed with Remington rifles, they had several field guns, and four or five machine guns of their own manufacture. If dislodged, they could retire to a still stronger position to their rear, on a range of hills. Practically, however, the French did very little. A force of 500 men had been driven back in January with loss by the Hovas, but from that time to the end of July they made no advance on the Hova lines. Reinforcements were brought from Tonquin, and Farafatte was always about to be reduced, but no serious attack was made. On the coast, the French were more active. The town of Vohemar was bombarded, and various towns were blockaded, especially Mahanoro, the port, which since the loss of Tamatave had become the centre of the Hovas' foreign trade. During the latter part of the year complete inaction prevailed. There was much sickness among the French troops, the Admiral was unable to act without instructions from his Government, and it was too late in the season for a march on the capital.

CHAPTER VII.

AMERICA.

UNITED STATES.—MEXICO.—WEST INDIES.—BRAZIL.—CHILI
AND PERU.

I. UNITED STATES.

THE state of political parties in the United States of America, as represented in Congress in the beginning of the year 1884, was as follows:

The Senate: Republicans, 40; Democrats, 36; total, 76.

The House of Representatives: Republicans, 119; Democrats, 200; Greenback-Labour, 2; Independents, 4; total, 325.

Mr. George D. Edmunds, of Vermont, was President *pro tem.* of the Senate; Mr. John G. Carlisle, of Kentucky, being Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The first part of the year, the political interest of the country chiefly centred in the proceedings of Congress, a fair idea of the actual work of which may be obtained from the following summary.

Towards the end of January the Senate passed the Sherman resolutions to investigate outrages in Virginia and Mississippi; but the inquiry added little to the stock of general information on the subject. The same month the Hon. Henry B. Payne was elected United States Senator from Ohio in place of the Hon. George H. Pendleton, author of "The Civil Service Law." This was considered a decided triumph of the so-called "spoils" section of the Ohio democracy. The reform of the Civil Service, it may be remarked, still continued to be a prominent political question. In transmitting to Congress early in the year the first annual report of the Civil Service Commissioners, in conformity with the Act of 1883 (an Act to regulate and improve the Civil Service of the United States), President Arthur took occasion in a special message "to congratulate Congress and the people on the good results which that law had already accomplished." He avowed his conviction that it would henceforth prove to be of still more signal benefit to the public service, and heartily commended the zeal and fidelity of the Commissioners, and their suggestion for further legislation. In view of the approaching presidential election, this endorsement of the Civil Service law, and of its beneficial working, was another blow to the many who might be disposed to look forward to departmental clerkships and other offices as the rewards of party allegiance.

On February 29 the Bill to provide for the construction of two cruisers, one despatch vessel, two heavy-armed gun-boats, two gun-boats, one cruising torpedo-boat, two harbour torpedo-boats, and one steel ram, at a cost not to exceed \$2,500,000, passed the Senate—yea 38, nay 13. The subject of enlarging the navy had been before Congress on more than one previous occasion; and the early passage of this Bill was the result of a growing popular feeling that the naval resources of the country required to be placed in a more satisfactory condition. In his last annual message the President has referred to this matter, setting forth the necessity of continued progress in the reconstruction of the navy. The recommendations in this direction of the Secretary of the Navy and the Naval Advising Board had been submitted to Congress by the President, unaccompanied by specific expressions of approval. But on March 26 he sent a special message to the Senate and House of Representatives, saying that he now deemed it his duty to advise that appropriation should be made during the session for enlarging the navy, by the construction of at least "the three additional steel cruisers

and the four gun-boats thus recommended, the cost of which, including their armament, will not exceed \$4,283,000, of which sum one-half should be appropriated for the next fiscal year." Such message made particular reference to the progress already made in reconstructing the United States navy by the building of four modern cruisers, the "Chicago," "Boston," "Atlanta," and "Dolphin," and of four double-turreted monitors, the "Puritan," "Amphitrite," "Terror," and "Monadnock." "It is not expected," wrote the President, "that one of the monitors will be a match for the heaviest broadside ironclads which certain other Governments have constructed at a cost of four or five millions each; but they will be armoured vessels of an improved and useful type, presenting limited surfaces for the shot of an enemy, and possessed of such sea-going capacity and offensive power as fully to answer our immediate necessities."

In the month of March some unpleasant feeling was occasioned by what became known as the "Lasker incident." The House of Representatives at Washington passed a sympathetic resolution on the occasion of the death of Dr. Lasker, which was forwarded to the American Minister at Berlin, with a request that it might be communicated to the Reichstag. In the ordinary routine of diplomatic intercourse this resolution was first presented to the Imperial Chancellor by Mr. Sargent, the Minister of the United States at the Court of Berlin. Prince Bismarck returned the resolution to Washington, and afterwards explained the reasons which prevented him from officially forwarding it to its destination. These may best be given, perhaps, in the words of the Imperial Chancellor himself, and especially as they very clearly set forth the political aspects of this incident. From the outset, he said, in addressing the Reichstag, he had regarded the Lasker resolution merely as an expression of the good feeling felt by the American House of Representatives towards Germany, a good feeling promoted and cultivated by himself. He should not have hesitated to forward the resolution to the Reichstag, had he not been prevented by the tenor of a certain passage in it which was not confined to a general expression of sympathy, but expressed the conviction that the labours of the deceased had been extraordinarily useful to Germany. That clause (in the opinion of the Chancellor) was directed against the policy which in the name of the Emperor he had hitherto pursued, and which had been opposed by Dr. Lasker for years past. It was now a question whether Dr. Lasker was right. In the affirmative case, the Emperor's policy and Prince Bismarck's own would be wrong. Dr. Lasker was member of a group which was in any case an opposition party. To this had to be added the fact that the members of that party had made immense capital out of Dr. Lasker's merits. The Prince could hardly be expected as Imperial Chancellor to submit the resolution to the Emperor, and without his approval he could do nothing. He could hardly be expected

to harness himself to the triumphal car of the Opposition, and to forward to the Reichstag in the name of the Emperor, furnished with his *visé*, so to say, a document which contained a condemnation of the imperial policy and his own. Dr. Lasker had introduced himself in America as the champion of German freedom against the despotic tendencies of the German Government impersonated in the Imperial Chancellor. Was he to make himself the postman of an enemy? Even if it might not be assumed that many people in America were intimately acquainted with the circumstances of Germany, at any rate the representative of the United States in Berlin or some other functionary empowered to report to the American Government might have possessed sufficient knowledge of German affairs to have sent a confidential warning against conferring on Prince Bismarck the part of postman. Unfortunately this was not the case. He had therefore instructed the German Minister in America that he could not possibly forward the address. He might further remark that the address did not proceed from Congress, as many people had imagined, but only from the House of Representatives; Congress consisting of a Senate and a House of Representatives. It was not his intention to cause any vexation to the United States, or to disturb Germany's relations with them. It was only that he could not undertake to make the opinion passed by the American House on Dr. Lasker his own. His wish that the good relations which had subsisted with America for the last hundred years might continue remained the same. His action was only forced upon him by the abuse which attended the vote of the House of Representatives. With the publication of this explanation in the American newspapers the subject dropped, though for a time it absorbed public attention.

The repeated dynamite outrages in England having called forth severe comment in the American press, President Arthur on March 14 issued an order to all the Government officials to enforce the existing law with regard to the shipment of explosives. His action met with general approval. His assertion that the honour of the American nation required that it should not be open to the imputation ("unfounded though it be") of the slightest appearance of tolerating such heinous crimes as those attempted in London, received especial commendation. The *New York Times*, discussing the President's action, expressed the cordial desire of the Government, which was shared by the whole people, to do all that could be done to prevent co-operation in America in the hideous crimes attempted in England. The *Evening Post*, referring to the same subject, said that this action ought to convince the English Government that the American Government were ready to do anything in reason to put a stop to the dynamite outrages. The law cited in the order was passed in 1866, and was designed to protect travellers as well as steamship and railway companies. It made it illegal to transport by land

or water anything like dynamite on passenger vessels or vehicles either between the States or between the States and foreign countries. Transportation by other conveyances was allowed only when the material was packed in non-explosive substances and plainly marked. Violations of this law were to be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000 or more than \$10,000. In case death was caused by the violation of the law, the crime was declared to be manslaughter, punishable by imprisonment for not less than two years. Dynamite outrages were unknown when the law passed, and its provisions aimed directly only at the shipment of dynamite as freight. There was no authorisation to search suspicious persons, and thus detect the presence of infernal machines in personal luggage. But President Arthur's action was allowed to be an earnest of the intention of the United States Government to do what lay in its power to prevent the shipment of explosives to England for criminal purposes.

On April 7 the Senate passed the Blair Education Bill, providing for national aid to common schools by a vote of 33 to 11. This Bill provided that for ten years next after its passage there should be annually appropriated from the money in the Treasury the following sums, to wit: the first year the sum of \$15,000,000; the second year the sum of \$14,000,000; the third year the sum of \$13,000,000; and thereafter a sum diminished \$1,000,000 yearly from the sum last appropriated, until the annual appropriations should have been made, when all appropriations under the Act should cease; which several sums should be expended to secure the benefits of common school education to all the children of a school age stated in the Bill, living in the United States. Several amendments were proposed, one of which by Mr. Hoar was agreed to, making the appropriations for "eight" instead of "ten" years, and fixing the following amounts—namely: "the first year the sum of \$7,000,000; the second year the sum of \$10,000,000; the third year the sum of \$15,000,000; the fourth year the sum of \$13,000,000; the fifth year the sum of \$11,000,000; the sixth year the sum of \$9,000,000; the seventh year the sum of \$7,000,000; the eighth year the sum of \$5,000,000. On the same day, in the House of Representatives, Mr. Converse moved to suspend the rules and pass the "Tariff on Wool Bill," for restoring the rates of duty on imported wool. The motion was rejected; yeas 119, nays 126 (a two-thirds vote being required). The so-called "Morrison Bill," proposing a reduction of the tariff on numerous dutiable imports, similarly failed to secure the assent of the House, which voted 159 to 155 to strike out the enacting clause of the Bill. A motion was made to reconsider the vote, which, however, was laid upon the table, thus disposing of the subject for the session. Among the more important public Acts passed during 1884 was one supplementary to that of 1882 relative to Chinese immigration; and also an Act creating a Bureau of Labour. The first, having refer-

ence to Chinese immigration, made several changes in the Act of 1882 ; not of such a kind, however, as to require notice here. The second instituted in the Department of the Interior an office the Commissioner of which "shall collect information" (so recites the Act) "upon the subject of labour, its relations to capital, the laws of labour, and the earnings of labouring men and women, and the means of promoting their material, social, intellectual, and moral prosperity."

On June 3rd the Republican National Convention met at Chicago, for the nomination of candidates to be supported for President and Vice-President of the United States. The "Platform," as adopted by the Republican party, maintained it to be "the first duty of a good Government to protect the rights and promote the interests of its own people. We therefore demand that the imposition of duties on foreign imports shall be made, not for revenue only, but that, in raising the requisite revenues for the Government, such duty shall be so levied as to afford security to our diversified industries and protection to the rights and wages of the labourer, to the end that active and intelligent labour, as well as capital, may have its just reward, and the labouring man his full share in the national prosperity." Against the so-called economic system of the Democratic party it entered its most earnest protest. The Democratic party had failed completely to relieve the people of the burden of unnecessary taxation by a wise reduction of the surplus.

It urged that efforts should be made to unite all commercial nations in the establishment of an international standard, which should fix for all the relative value of gold and silver coinage. It held the principle of the public regulation of railroad corporations to be a wise and salutary one for the protection of all classes of the people, and therefore favoured legislation that should prevent unjust discrimination and excessive charges for transportation, and that should secure to the people and the railways alike the fair and equal protection of the laws. The "Platform" denounced the importation of contract labour, whether from Europe or Asia, as an offence against the spirit of American institutions, and pledged itself to sustain the present law restricting Chinese immigration, and to provide such further legislation as was necessary to carry out its purposes.

With regard to the reform of the Civil Service, "auspiciously begun under Republican administration," the "Platform" urged that it should be completed by the further extension of the reform system already established by law to all grades of the service to which it is applicable. Lastly, it favoured a policy which should keep the United States from entangling alliances with foreign nations, and which gave the country the right to expect that foreign nations should refrain from meddling in American affairs—a policy which sought peace and trade with all Powers, but especially with those of the Western Hemisphere.

The "Platform" was adopted unanimously. The candidates—James G. Blaine, of Maine, for President; and John A. Logan, of Illinois, for Vice-President—were nominated June 6, Mr. Blaine on the fourth ballot, and General Logan on the first.

The Democratic National Convention met at Chicago July 8. The "Platform" which it adopted declared the Republican party to be, so far as principle is concerned, a reminiscence. In practice it was an organisation for enriching those who controlled its machinery.

The Democracy pledged itself to purify the Administration from corruption, to restore economy, to revive respect for the law, and to reduce taxation to the lowest limit consistent with due regard to the preservation of the faith of the nation to its creditors and pensioners. It denounced the abuses of the existing tariff, and within certain limitations, demanded that Federal taxation should be exclusively for public purposes, and should not exceed the needs of the Government economically administered. The "Platform" favoured an American continental policy, based upon more intimate commercial and political relations with the fifteen sister republics of North, Central, and South America, but entangling alliances with none. It likewise favoured "honest Civil Service reform," and the compensation of all United States officers by fixed salaries; the separation of Church and State; and the diffusion of free education by common schools, so that every child in the land might be taught the rights and duties of citizenship.

Finally, "instead of the Republican party's British policy, the National Convention demanded, in behalf of the American Democracy, an American policy." "Instead of the Republican party's discredited scheme and false pretence of friendship for American labour, expressed by imposing taxes, we demand, in behalf of the Democracy, freedom for American labour by reducing taxes, to the end that these United States may compete with unhindered Powers for the primacy among nations in all the arts of peace and fruits of liberty."

The "Platform" was adopted without a division, after a substitute offered by Benjamin F. Butler, of Massachusetts, was voted down—yeas 97½, nays 714½. The candidates—Grover Cleveland, of New York, for President; and Thomas A. Hendricks, of Indiana, for Vice-President—were nominated July 12, Governor Cleveland on the second ballot, and ex-Governor Hendricks on the first.

In addition to the "Platforms" of the two great parties in the State, there was a "Greenback-Labour Platform," which nominated Benjamin F. Butler, of Massachusetts, as candidate for President; and A. M. West, of Mississippi, for Vice-President; and a "Prohibition Platform," which nominated John P. St. John, of Kansas, for President; and William Daniel, of Maryland, for Vice-President.

One result of the nomination of Mr. Blaine was an enthusiastic

meeting of Republicans and Independents convened at Boston, which selected a committee of one hundred, and another committee of twenty-five, to attend a conference in New York, to be held four days thereafter. At that conference Mr. George William Curtis presided, and resolutions were adopted antagonistic to Mr. Blaine. Immediately on the nomination of Mr. Cleveland by the National Democratic Convention, the Massachusetts Reform Club sent a congratulatory despatch, and passed resolutions pledging hearty support to the Democratic ticket. The national conference of Independents was held in New York July 22, when the Hon. C. R. Codman presided. Resolutions were adopted advising all voters opposed to Mr. Blaine's election to vote for Governor Cleveland. Party feeling now ran very high. General Butler collected the odds and ends of the Labour party, and formed them into what he called the People's Organisation. He and Mr. Blaine made an unexampled tour of the North as speakers in their own behalf; or rather Mr. Blaine stumped for himself, and General Butler, while nominally doing the same thing, was (such was the general opinion) really working for the Republican candidate. The week preceding the election a remarkable demonstration in favour of Mr. Cleveland was made in New York. A procession of citizens, numbering many thousands, paraded the city. Men representing all trades and professions were in the line; eminent merchants, lawyers, bankers, editors, and most of the members of the various commercial exchanges were there. No such procession had ever been seen in the city; thousands of men walked in procession for the first time in their lives; many of the buildings along the line were decorated. The men marched in platoons fourteen abreast, with bands of music and waving of banners. The streets were thronged with people. The cheering in the ranks and from the crowds was almost incessant. The demonstration made it evident that the state of feeling was more intense than had existed since the war. The struggle ended in the election of Governor Cleveland, who obtained 219 electoral votes from twenty States, while Mr. Blaine carried eighteen States with 182 votes. Neither party had a majority of the popular vote of the country. The vote of New York, upon which the result depended, was in suspense from November 4 until November 15, when the official returns gave the Cleveland electors 1,047 plurality, and made him the next President of the United States. So ended one of the most keenly contested Presidential elections on record. Mr. Cleveland owed his success to the Independent Republicans, who resisted against Mr. Blaine. Without them he would have been defeated. He was accepted as the representative of the reform element in America, his previous "record" as Governor giving assurance that, if elected to the chief magistracy, his would be a conservative and honest administration. Mr. Blaine's defeat, on the other hand, was regarded by all, except his partisans, as the overthrow of the more corrupt supporters of the Republican party. The *New York*

Herald, in discussing the results of the campaign, declared Governor Cleveland's election to be "a very great gain to the country and cause of free government everywhere. The candidacy of a man like Mr. Blaine, with his surroundings, was a humiliating disgrace to the country. His election would have been a national justification of public dishonesty and trickery of every kind. It would have whitewashed every jobber in the country, and would have been an invitation to all young men in places of trust to abuse those trusts. Mr. Cleveland has shown himself, as Mayor and Governor, an incorruptibly honest man of brains and undoubted courage, the enemy of jobs and jobbers, the faithful servant of the people. Every word he uttered during the canvass, as every message and other public utterance of his as Mayor and Governor, marks him as a clear-headed, sagacious man, entirely capable of the great work which the people have entrusted to him to do at Washington. At last the country has that change of parties for which it has been ready for eight years, and which the selfish and corrupt political managers, who gained the control of the Republican party, had come to believe they could prevent so easily, that they dared to nominate one of their worst men." The *New York Evening Post* declared that since the fall of Richmond there had been no such triumph in America. "We have saved and vindicated our national honour before the world. We have made it plain to all the world that our highest office cannot be bought, and that no man can enter into it with a tarnished record." The general result of the election was the complete defeat of the Republican party, which had so long held office, thus ensuring many radical changes in the public policy of the country.

The announcement in the President's message (1884) that a treaty had been negotiated between the American and Nicaraguan Governments, giving the former the right to construct a canal across Nicaraguan territory, excited much public attention. There was general surprise that the outgoing Administration should reopen the question, which was likely to prove embarrassing to the new President and his advisers. The leading journals drew attention to the fact that the proposed treaty reopened the discussion with England concerning American rights and duties under the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. The treaty provided that a strip of land two and a half miles wide, with the canal in the centre, should be appropriated for the uses of the canal, but be jointly owned by the two Powers, and be under Nicaraguan jurisdiction in time of peace.

The American Government, it was stipulated, was to furnish the entire capital for the construction, and have full power to select the route, and arrange the details of the construction, and assume the responsibility of defending the country through which the canal passed. Both Governments were to control the waterway, and their coastwise commerce was to have favouring tolls; all other nations to be allowed to use the canal on equal terms.

The balance of revenue, after the expenses of maintenance and improvement were paid, was to be divided—two-thirds to the United States, and one-third to Nicaragua. The work, it was stipulated, should begin within two years after the treaty had been ratified, and be completed within ten. Four million dollars were to be lent to Nicaragua for the construction and internal improvements to serve as an aid to the business of the canal, and were to be paid back from the earnings.

In submitting the treaty to the Senate, the President sent an earnest message urging its speedy ratification. He said the United States had no motive or desire for territorial acquisition, or political control beyond their present borders, and none such was contemplated by the treaty. The two Governments united in framing this scheme as the sole means by which a work, as indispensable to the one as to the other, could be accomplished under such circumstances as to prevent alike the possibility of conflict between them and interference from without.

The President not having the sole power of making treaties, it was necessary that the Nicaraguan Convention should be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. At the close of the year 1884 such ratification had not been made, and it was more than doubtful whether it would; it being generally admitted that the existence of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty between England and the United States was an obstacle in the way. The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty (it may be remarked) was concluded in 1850, "with reference to any means of communication by ship canal which may be constructed between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, by the way of the river San Juan de Nicaragua and either or both of the Lakes of Nicaragua and Managua, to any port or place on the Pacific Ocean." Neither Power was to have exclusive control over such a canal. We may point out that the provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty which had been discussed since Mr. Arthur succeeded General Garfield as President, in a correspondence between Lord Granville and Mr. Frelinghuysen with reference to the Panama Canal, are referred to in the preceding year's volume.

The annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury showed that the receipts for the fiscal year ending June 1884 amounted to \$348,000,000, and the expenditure to \$291,000,000. The receipts for the fiscal year 1884-85 were estimated at \$330,000,000, and the expenditure at \$290,000,000. The receipts for the fiscal year ending June 1886 were estimated at \$330,000,000, and the expenditure at \$324,000,000. In a general review of the financial position of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury advocated the appointment of a Commission to study the question of increasing the foreign trade, and he referred to the great trade of England with South America, for which the United States ought, he said, to compete. Such a Commission in commencing its labours should regard it as settled that the revenue should not exceed the sum required for the support of the Government, and the

gradual reduction of the Public Debt, that manufacturers should not be placed in jeopardy by radical or sweeping changes in the tariff. It must not be inferred, the Treasurer continued, that he did not favour a reform of the tariff, but rather that the subjects of the tariff and the foreign trade are so intimately connected that they must be considered together. He recommended the removal of the duties on raw materials used in manufacturing, and a reduction of the duties on articles used or consumed by those who are least able to bear the burden of taxation. He saw no good reason for any internal duties, except on whisky. He laid special stress on the necessity of efforts being made to secure trade with South America, and to revive American shipping; and favoured the granting of Government aid to United States steamship lines, either by means of liberal payments for the transportation of mails or in some other form. He called attention to the fact that there was no surplus of gold in the Treasury, and that the reserve had been trenched upon. There was no plethora except of silver dollars, for which there was no demand, and the Treasurer was forced to the conclusion that unless the coinage of silver dollars and the issue of silver certificates were suspended, there was a danger that silver instead of gold would become the metallic standard in the United States. The danger might not be imminent, but it was of so serious a character that there ought to be no delay in providing against it.

As regards the trade of the United States, the year 1884 was one of curtailment in production and industry, and of shrinkage in the market value of nearly all articles, but yet it was not a year of exceptional depression. A year that produced 1,800,000,000 bushels of corn, surpassing every previous year's record, and nearly 30 per cent. ahead of 1883; that could show 520,000,000 bushels of wheat, against 410,000,000 bushels in 1883, and 510,000,000 bushels in 1882; and that produced hay, potatoes, and oats in rich abundance, could hardly be set down as an unprosperous year. There was a yield of cotton large enough for all needs, and for which the world paid prices that would enrich the poorest section of the country; there was a petroleum production of above 26,000,000 barrels, not far from the largest on record; there was an output of coal probably exceeding, anthracite and bituminous combined, any other year; and there was a production of pig iron, though seventeen per cent. less than that of 1883, still somewhat larger than in the census year of 1880. The curtailment of the iron industry, the decrease in the clearing-house exchanges, and the decline in prices, were the unpropitious factors in the year which closed December 31, 1884. The balance of trade was unfavourable at the opening of the year, which was a period of many financial catastrophes; and the deficient harvests of 1883 caused a considerable export of gold in the earlier months of 1884; but this last was compensated for by the gold movement towards America in the later part of the year. The exports from the

country were below those of 1883 up to July, and from that date the imports were largely reduced ; so that on the whole the balance of trade remained favourable. Estimated for eleven months of 1884, the export trade stood at \$655,000,000, as against \$720,000,000 in the corresponding period of 1883 ; and the imports at \$595,000,000, as against \$633,000,000 for the like period.

It remains to be noted that a new Atlantic cable was laid between Great Britain and the United States, and made available for telegraphic messages in 1884. The completion of this enterprise, conjunctively with Mr. John W. Mackay and Mr. James Gordon Bennett, inaugurated a new era in the history of ocean telegraphy, for theirs is the first submarine cable yet landed in the heart of a great commercial centre such as New York, where the principal office is established two doors from the Stock Exchange. The advantage thus gained in being able to transmit messages directly over the cable, without the risk of delay on land telegraph lines, is undoubtedly a great boon to the commercial public.

II. MEXICO.

The year 1884 has been one of considerable importance as regards the foreign relations of Mexico.

The negotiations of the special envoys of the English and Mexican Governments in Mexico and London were brought to a successful termination by the signing, on August 6, in the former city, of the agreement for the renewal of diplomatic relations between the two countries. The principal heads of agreement signed by Colonel Spenser St. John and Señor José Fernandez are as follows:—

Article I. The Mexican Government will order an impartial investigation to be made with respect to all pecuniary claims of British subjects, based on acts of the Federal Government of Mexico anterior to the exchange of the ratification of these preliminaries, and will provide for the liquidation of the amounts which may be found to be due to them, as well as for the payment of those already recognised by the same Federal Government.

Art. II. The British Government, on its side, will also examine impartially all the pecuniary claims of Mexican citizens, based on acts of the British Government anterior to the date of the exchange of the ratification of these preliminaries, and will order the liquidation and payment of the sums which may be found due to them.

Art. III. The high contracting parties agree to extend each other reciprocally for six years, reckoning from the date of the exchange of the ratification of these preliminaries, the treatment of the most favoured nation in all matters whatsoever.

On the opening of Congress (September 16) and the submission of the agreement as required by the constitution for its ratification by the Senate, a strong opposition was shown to the

first article, which was supposed to be intended to revive all the obnoxious features of the former convention of 1851. This feeling was intensified by notices which appeared in many of the local newspapers, in which it was endeavoured to connect the proposed unpopular conversion of the English debt, of which mention will be made later, with the renewal of relations, and reached such a pitch that at one time it was doubtful whether the agreement would be ratified at all. It required all the tact and management of the British Envoy to calm the excitement by judicious explanations, and the measure was eventually passed with only one dissentient voice. The ratifications were duly exchanged on October 27.

Sir Spenser St. John was forthwith gazetted on November 28 as Her Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Mexico, and Mr. Mariscal was appointed Mexican Minister to London. The Reciprocity Treaty between the United States and Mexico was duly ratified by the American Senate (March 11), and by the Mexican Senate (May 14). The provisions of the treaty have not, however, as yet come into force, in view of an objection brought forward by its opponents in the former country, that all matters affecting the revenue must be submitted to the House of Representatives. Up to the present time no action has been taken in regard to it.

The agreement for the reciprocal passage of troops across the Mexican frontier in pursuit of hostile Indians, which expired in August, was again renewed.

Some interest was excited by the arrival in December of the American Commissioners, Messrs. Reynolds and Thatcher, appointed by the United States Government to visit the different countries of Central and South America, with the object of promoting American trade. In spite of the reserve which was naturally maintained, it was believed that the real object the Commissioners had in view was to prepare the way for a proposal of something like a Customs Union between the two countries. The pacific attainment of an overwhelming influence in Mexican affairs, almost amounting to control, is so evidently a part of the United States policy at the present moment, as to render it possible that this belief was well founded, and it is further borne out by the publication of the Nicaragua Canal Treaty. The temper of the Mexican people, however, on the subject is such as to render it improbable that propositions of such a nature would be seriously entertained.

As regards the relations of Mexico with other countries, it may be said that they are becoming more extended. In January the Mexican Minister in Spain was accredited also to the King of Portugal, and presented his credentials, and it is understood that the Portuguese Minister in Washington is to be accredited also to Mexico.

The discontent arising from the forced circulation of nickel

money had culminated (December 1883) in a riot, in which fortunately no more harm was done than the breaking of windows; but the temper of the people on the subject was, however, so unmistakably shown, that the Government was obliged to take immediate steps for removing it from circulation. An arrangement was eventually made with the National Bank, which, in consideration of an issue of certificates payable by 15 per cent. of the Customs duties collected at the principal ports of the republic, undertook to demonetise the entire nickel currency. The obligations incurred by the Government in this arrangement were exchanged on May 31 for a new series of certificates redeemable by 5 per cent. of the total Customs revenue. The purchase of the metal, expenses of coining, commission on issue, and eventual demonetisation, have cost the country little less than three and a half millions of dollars, a loss which was wholly due to the ill-advised attempt to place the entire amount of the currency on the market at once, instead of doing so gradually.

With the object of building up a Mexican mercantile marine, a Bill was passed towards the end of 1883 establishing a differential rate of duties for goods brought in Mexican bottoms, amounting to 2 per cent. reduction on all but Asiatic produce, and 4 and 8 per cent. on the latter respectively, according to whether the vessels which brought them made irregular voyages or belonged to regular lines. Almost simultaneously with the publication of this law, the first steamer of the Mexican Transatlantic Steamship Company, the *Tamaulipas*, entered Vera Cruz harbour, and her arrival was celebrated with great festivities. Since then two more vessels belonging to this line have been completed, and are now making periodical trips from Europe.

A concession was also given to a company calling itself the Mexican Pacific Navigation Company, for running a line of steamers between the Pacific ports of the republic and Hong-Kong, touching at Honolulu and San Francisco. The company have not as yet bought any vessels, but they propose to do the service for the first year or two with chartered steamers. It is understood that the first steamer will soon arrive from China.

One of the most important, if not the most important, events of the year was the opening of the Central Railway to traffic (April 30). This line, 1,870 kilometres in length, connects the city of Mexico with the town of El Paso on the American frontier, and joining there the Atchison Topeka and Santa Fé Railway, brings Mexico into communication with the entire railway system of the United States. Unfortunately the first few months of regular traffic on this line were marked by repeated attempts to throw the trains off the track, from motives of revenge or robbery. The stories which found their way into the newspapers were generally much exaggerated; and before the close of the year the road was reported to be clear from danger of molestation.

The lamentable condition of the Public Treasury during the past year reacted, as is usually the case in Mexico, on commerce, producing a general stagnation throughout the country; and the attempt of the Government in March to make good the deficiencies of the revenue by obliging merchants and shopkeepers to put stamps of different values on all articles they had in stock, while failing in its object to procure a large sum of ready money for the Treasury, only added to the existing depression. Moreover, the closing (April 30) of the Monte de Piedad, the national pawnbroking establishment, which had in the past few years added banking to its other business, was the cause of much distress among the lower classes, by whom its notes were largely held; and this distress was still more aggravated by the partial failure of the maize crop throughout the country, due to the unusually dry weather. On the whole it may be said that the year 1884 was one of the most disastrous, commercially and financially, known in Mexico for a long time.

While the embarrassments of the Government may be ascribed generally to maladministration, and the reckless granting of subventions for public works, the hopeless entanglement of its finances in the last year of the late administration can be directly traced to the issue of nickel and its subsequent withdrawal, and to the expenses incurred by the Government in attempting to build the railway across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, which together cost the Treasury between five and six millions of dollars. To cover this amount recourse was had to the National Bank, which towards the end of the year had acquired a lien on upwards of 50 per cent. of the customs receipts, the principal branch of the revenue; and this, added to the other obligations of the Treasury for railway subventions, payment of the American claims and Carvajal bonds, and indebtedness to individuals, produced a deadlock for which a radical change of administration, which was happily forthcoming on the entry of the new Government to power, was the only solution. The National Bank, being an institution of only limited resources, found itself ere long unable to sustain the Government unaided, and seeing its commercial credit on the wane, proposed a fusion with the Mercantile Bank. For some time the latter institution, which numbered among its directors and shareholders some of the richest men in Mexico, held aloof, but at last yielded to the pressure brought to bear upon it, and the fusion was effected in May. A new concession was granted to the National Bank of Mexico, as it was then styled, by which a virtual monopoly of the right of issue was secured to it, and it was guaranteed all the Treasury business on highly advantageous terms.

To clear off the indebtedness of the Treasury to the Bank, it was proposed to issue a loan of \$30,000,000, bearing 7 per cent. interest, and secured upon the direct contributions, and the Franco-Egyptian Bank, the parent branch of the original National Bank, undertook to take up the issue; but finding that it was necessary

before this could be satisfactorily effected to restore the credit of Mexico abroad by making some settlement of the English debt, an agent of the Bank, Mr. Noetzlin, was sent to London with powers from the Mexican Government to come to some arrangement with the committee of bondholders. The result of the negotiations was a more disastrous fiasco even than that of 1883. A clause in the agreement, which stipulated for an issue of 2,700,000*l.* new bonds, to be applied in its greater part to the payment of the expenses of conversion, met with decided marks of popular disapproval in Mexico, culminating in riots in the streets of the capital, and attended in several cases with loss of life. In presence of this expression of feeling, the majority in Congress which supported the conversion gradually dwindled away, and the Government and the Bank were reluctantly obliged to relinquish the whole scheme.

General Diaz, who had been elected to the Presidency by an overwhelming majority, took the oath and was formally installed as President (December 1), and great hopes are entertained that his promised reforms of the administration, and especially the fiscal department, will be no less thorough because they have not been hastily planned and carried into effect.

III. WEST INDIES—CUBA—HAYTI.

West Indies.—During the year the British Minister at Washington opened negotiations with the Government of the United States with the view of ensuring the admission of raw sugar from the West Indies duty free, or at nominal rates, in consideration of a reduction by the West Indian Governments of the import duties on such American produce as breadstuffs, salt fish, and timber. If the "most favoured nation" clauses of the Commercial Treaty of 1815 between Great Britain and the United States had not been limited to British territories in Europe, and could apply to the West Indian colonies, there would have been no need for action. But according to existing rates the very lowest class of sugar from the West Indies paid an import duty of 8*l.* a ton, with 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, this high duty being maintained for the political purposes of the Protectionist party. The negotiations were therefore set on foot during the year, with the object of obtaining the admission of West Indian produce on terms as favourable as those accorded to other countries.

Throughout the West Indies the conditions of life seemed to weigh heavily on the poorer and native classes. Wages for men averaged 1*s.* a day, whilst a pound of bread cost 3*d.* to 3½*d.* Taxes on food contributed from 25 to 30 per cent. of the whole taxation. Population showed signs of declining, and the mortality amongst infants alone was about 30 per cent., and the physique of the negro was deteriorating—symptoms attributable to poor food, and the severe import duties hindering the introduction of proper

food. In view of this state of things, the Legislative Assembly of Dominica passed a resolution declaring the only way out of the present difficulties was either to admit the produce of the colony duty free into the United States, or in the cession of the island to the Union. In Jamaica it was proposed to sacrifice 50,000*l.* of revenue by reducing the high food tariffs and the duties on ordinary goods, and by abolishing the export duties. To meet this, an increase of the land-tax would bring in 30,000*l.*, an education rate 15,000*l.*, and a new tariff for licences and duties on spirits 20,000*l.* A curious display of insular jealousy was given by Jamaica when the Legislature rejected by a nearly unanimous vote the proposal of a political and commercial confederation with Canada.

In the Windward Islands, where no common method of raising revenue exists, each has its own fiscal system, and in all of them the customs and port charges are high. In accordance with recommendations of the Royal Commission, it was proposed that Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, and Tobago should be formed into a federation, with St. George, in Grenada, as the capital. By this arrangement 11,000*l.* a year would be saved in official and administrative services. It was also suggested that a general Civil Service, with uniform rules for entrance, salaries, promotion, pensions, and duties, should be organised for the Crown colonies of Jamaica, British Honduras, the Leeward Islands, and the lesser Windward Islands; whilst Barbados, British Guiana, and Trinidad, which claim the privilege of independent colonies, should be invited to join. The administration could then be worked with a smaller staff, and at a lesser cost. Uniformity of system would also be secured in accounts, statistics, internal taxation, and customs charges, which at present differ in every island. There was also some talk of incorporating the West Indies into the Canadian Dominion, but the objections to such a plan, both on the ground of political expediency and of the certain disappointment to both parties, were overwhelming, and the subject was not seriously pursued. As Canada now competes with the United States in sugar-refining and other manufactures which draw their raw material from the West Indies, and as she can export corn, timber, and fish as plentifully and as cheaply as the United States, there is nothing to hinder the full development of trade between the Canadians and the West Indies except the mischievously high tariffs maintained on both sides. If these were lowered, the difficulties of the situation would vanish, and there would be no need for either legislation or confederation.

In Trinidad the planters have felt severely the low prices of sugar, and attempted to reduce the cost of production by exacting more work from the coolies. They even obtained leave to raise the labour standard, meaning thereby the lowering of wages without the consent of the labourer; but in this proposal the planters received no encouragement from the Government. In a matter

however, which specially concerned the town of San Fernando, the conduct of the local authorities was less creditable. With little or no warning, orders were issued prohibiting during the Mohur-rum festival (October 30) the coolie processions, which, since the introduction of coolie labour into the island, had been allowed to parade the town. The coolies forthwith petitioned the Government to the effect that such a step was an infringement of their rights, as, on leaving India, they had been guaranteed against any interference with their religious ceremonies. The main feature of these annual processions consisted in throwing into the sea the "tabuts," or toy mausoleums of gilt paper, which the coolies imagined enclosed the bodies of their slaughtered saints. The authorities, however, treated the coolies' petition with contempt, and on the latter proceeding towards the sea they were confronted by a body of black police, behind whom were English soldiers and marines. In spite of a command to disperse, the coolies continued to advance, whereupon the commanding officer gave orders to fire, with the result that thirteen of the immigrants were killed and eighty-nine wounded. At Port of Spain the authorities had offered no opposition to similar processions on the same day, and the coolies had cast their "tabuts" into the surf without molesting or being molested. The Secretary of State for the Colonies, on being informed of the circumstances of the "massacre" at San Fernando, directed an independent inquiry to be held, the outcome of which was not made known before the close of the year.

Cuba.—The continuous fall in the price of sugar had brought ruin to the class to which hitherto the island owed its prosperity; and if Cuba was to be saved, it was clear the cost of living must be reduced, the administration and taxation improved, and freer markets obtained for her products. Negotiations were consequently opened with the United States, and on April 7 the United States Minister at Madrid started for Washington to advise with his Government on the Spanish proposals. But almost simultaneously a raid upon Cuba was made by "General" Arguëro and twenty-five men from Key West, in Florida. This young patriot, or filibuster, was the son of General Arguëro, shot in 1851 with others for participation in the rebellion of which Lopez was chief. That rebellion, regarded by the native Cubans as something like a holy war, had been brought about by intolerable grievances, for which no redress could be obtained at Havanna or Madrid. The new leader was already credited with achievements of his own that made him popular, and his enterprise was considered to be by no means hopeless. Accompanied by the insurgent generals Garcia, Matos, and Torres, and about twenty-five men, he effected his embarkation so cunningly that the American authorities were unable to prevent it. But fortune did not favour his venture. On April 10 a party of forty-one men under Victor Duran, who were trying to join Arguëro,

were surrounded by the royal troops, and a terrible combat ensued, Duran and thirty-seven of his men being killed, and the remaining four taken prisoners. Early in May, Barona, Arguëro's second in command, with four of his followers, was captured. Arguëro himself contrived to elude the royal troops; his little force, divided into bands of four and five men, managed to conceal themselves in the wild and difficult region of Cienaga de Zapata, the troops guarding all the known outlets; and Arguëro's efforts to free the island resulted in little more than a series of raids upon peaceful citizens.

The Spanish Minister of the Colonies introduced (June 30) a Bill into the Chamber of Deputies in Madrid for improving the situation in Cuba. It proposed a reduction of the export duty on exported sugar; and the increase of the import duty held out the hope of treaties of commerce with foreign nations, and promised economy with the Cuban Budget. With regard to the United States at least Spain was enabled to redeem her promise to her richest colonial possession; raw sugar and tobacco duty free, and other products were admitted to the ports of the mainland at reduced duties; while the Cuban and Porto Rico tariffs were to be modified so as to admit American flour on the same footing as Spanish, and duties on salt fish and manufactures were considerably reduced.

Except by the slight and fruitless attempt in the early part of the year the peace of the island was undisturbed, and the Spanish Government began to look leniently on those who had given them so much trouble. The Cuban refugee Maceo, whose surrender to the Spanish Government a year or two ago, after he had taken refuge at Gibraltar, was considered such an injustice, received his liberty early in the year, but, like other Cuban exiles, he was interned at Port Mahon on parole. It was reported, however, in October, that he, Castillo, and another prisoner had succeeded in making their escape; but up to the close of the year they gave no sign of intending to disturb the peace of their native island.

Hayti.—The rebellion which had been going on for some weeks in the land of the "Black Republic" at the close of 1883 was crushed at the beginning of 1884. Miragoane surrendered to the Government (January 10), and the towns of Jacmel and Jeremie were once more opened to foreign commerce. It was reported that 7,000 persons had been killed during the rebellion, whilst the cruelties after its suppression were, if true, of a revolting character. They were, however, denied by the Haytian Legation in Paris, and no further investigation ensued. The President, anxious to remove painful reminiscences, issued a decree granting a complete amnesty to all citizens who had been compelled to leave Hayti in consequence of political events, and also pardoning those Haytians who had been condemned by court-martial, in April 1882, for taking part in political demonstrations.

IV. SOUTH AMERICA.—BRAZIL, ARGENTINE REPUBLIC, ETC.

Brazil.—Brazil still remains the only State in America where slavery legally exists, but the desire to shake off the stigma grows in strength. Unfortunately the authorities do not move as fast as popular feeling. Since 1871 private generosity has liberated 90,000 slaves, and 19,000 more have been set free under the provisions of the Rio Branco Law at a cost of 80*l.* per head; but even at this rate of progress, countenanced as it is by the Emperor, many years must elapse before the final emancipation of the blacks, of whom there are still 1,500,000 slaves. In the course of the year the province of Ceara set a laudable example to the rest of the country by giving freedom, without Government aid, to its entire slave population, which was estimated at 30,000 in the year 1881; whilst the province of Amazonas applied the large surplus of its Budget to the freeing of all slaves within its borders. Other provinces passed regulations forbidding the importation of slaves, and individual slave-owners of all classes vied with each other in substituting free for slave labour on their estates. The Prime Minister (Senhor Dantas), moreover, introduced into the Chamber of Deputies a Bill by which he hoped to bring about the total abolition of slavery within ten or twelve years. This Bill proposed to confine the slaves to their respective provinces, to impose a national emancipation tax, to liberate all slaves of sixty years of age or upwards, to compel free men to work, and to establish a new register in which the slaves should be valued according to their age. The Premier was, however, defeated on this Bill by 59 to 52, and the Emperor, acting on his advice, but against that of the Council of State, dissolved the Chamber, and an appeal to the country followed. The definite issue placed before the electors was whether the Rio Branco Act of 1871 should be strictly enforced, and another and a wider measure of emancipation added to it. The contest, in truth, lay between the abolitionists, who wished to secure for the slave gradual but full freedom with efficient protection pending his definite manumission, and the emancipators, who, while setting him nominally free, would keep him in cleverly forged bonds. The one party regarded slavery as a national disgrace; but the other looked upon it as the "basis of national prosperity," and its total abolition as ruin to the planters, stoppage of the banks, and failure to the majority of commercial houses.

The financial condition of the country hardly justified any quixotic enterprises involving a large expenditure. The public debt, including the paper currency, depreciated by 25 per cent., exceeded 80,000,000*l.* The Paraguayan war, the more recent northern famine, the reckless promotion of railways, and extravagance in military matters had for some years caused the Budget

to show an average annual deficit of more than 2,000,000*l.* Taxation was already so heavy, that any increase might provoke popular discontent. Consequently Senhor Dantas's proposal of a further annual addition of 1,500,000*l.* to the Budget for the emancipation of 28,000 slaves each year was not received with enthusiasm. Senhor Dantas's scheme, after a long discussion, was rejected by the Brazilian Legislature on the ground that it went too far. But from the outset it was clear that the abolitionists would be content with nothing less than what Senhor Dantas proposed, and it was equally certain that the planters, who had successfully defied the slavery enactments of 1831, 1852, and 1871, would do their utmost to hinder any legislation that promised to be prompt and efficient. In spite of their indebtedness to the Rio Janeiro banks (5,000,000*l.*) it would yet seem to the advantage of the slave-owners to agree with their opponents on some progressive settlement of the slavery question. The cry for emancipation has been growing steadily, and it is not likely to be silenced by the opposition of the planters. Moreover, the present depreciation in the value of land in Brazil is a sign that abolition is the preoccupation of the hour, and must be disposed of before the country can secure commercial quiet. The result of the elections was not known before the close of the year, but it was believed to be in favour of Senhor Dantas's policy. With regard to railways, it seems that five-sixths of those constructed with Government guarantee only earn enough to pay the bare working expenses, leaving the Government the burden of paying the whole of the 7 per cent. guaranteed to the shareholders, whilst some do not earn their expenses. The really necessary railways have long since been constructed, and those now being made are more or less luxuries.

A new coffee tree, called *Maragogipe*, has been discovered in Brazil, and a Commission has decided that it produces not only a larger crop, but that the berry itself is much larger, with a very fine flavour. It does well on the high grounds, and the first planters that have adopted it are so delighted with it that they are cutting down their well-established trees of the old variety and planting the new. Considerable efforts are being made to promote European emigration to Southern Brazil, where the climate and country are especially suitable for successful colonisation.

Argentine Republic.—The year opened most favourably in this country, the harvest prospects promising immense quantities of wheat, maize, and linseed, and the farmers anticipating a season that would eclipse the famous year 1879. There was, too, an abundance of wool, and of so good a quality that it realised unprecedented prices. Immigration progressed steadily; during 1883 there had been about 75,000 arrivals in the city of Buenos Ayres, the largest number on record. A great proportion, of whom 30 per cent. were young women, came from Italy, and were

drawn from a better class of the population than in previous years.

The principal political event of the year was the inauguration of the city of La Plata as the new capital of the province of Buenos Ayres. A great hindrance, hitherto, to the development of the commerce of this republic has been the want of a good seaport. Buenos Ayres itself had only a shallow roadstead, and vessels had to lie miles off the shore exposed to violent winds. To remedy this, the National Congress decided, chiefly through the energy of Dr. Rocha, Governor of the province, to provide a new commercial port which should supersede the old city of Buenos Ayres. Forty miles below the latter place, on the shores of a fine natural harbour called Enseñada, the new city has begun to rise, and extensive harbour works have been taken in hand, for which a loan for 2,254,000*l.* was contracted in London. The population, industry, and trade of the new capital are increasing rapidly. The Argentine Congress was opened on May 6 by General Roca, President of the republic, who announced that excellent relations existed between the republic and foreign States, and declared the national finances to be in a flourishing condition. He also dwelt upon the constant development of trade, and the increase of the customs revenue both at Buenos Ayres and Rosario, and stated that railway communication would shortly be extended to all the principal points of the republic. In spite, however, of the rosy view of the situation taken by the President during the latter part of the year, the money market caused some anxiety. Speculation had been rife, and the Argentine authorities had been trying to accomplish in twelve months works which should have been extended over several years. The country had been spending immense sums of borrowed money, mostly, however, in the construction of railways and other reproductive works; but not the less was there a general feeling that it would be wise to give the country a little rest. Moreover, the State banks had given to speculators more accommodation than they ought; this, and the Government demand for public works, raised the price of gold. President Roca, however, expressed an opinion in November that "the present state of the country, from an economical and financial point of view, constitutes the period of the greatest commercial and industrial development yet experienced." He further stated that during the rest of his term of office he did not think it would be necessary to contract any new loans, and he should oppose any project tending to increase the public debt. He considered the depression as transitory because fictitious, and there was really nothing to cause alarm. As to the rumours in circulation with respect to the probable suspension of specie payments, he said he would sooner sell Government House than consent to it. These opinions of President Roca helped to restore public confidence, and a more cheerful feeling prevailed at the close of the year.

V. PERU, CHILI, AND BOLIVIA.

Peru.—The symptoms of civil war in Peru which appeared towards the close of 1883, when the conditions of peace with Chili became known, continued more or less throughout the year 1884. As soon as General Caceres knew that a number of towns were to remain in the occupation of the Chilians after the signature of the treaty, he raised a band of mutineers from the army, and declared he would not submit to a national humiliation. Rather than bring on a renewal of the four years' war between Peru and herself, Chili consented to evacuate several positions earlier than had been agreed upon, and these were accordingly occupied by the regular Peruvian troops. This had the effect of checking the rebellion for the moment, and various revolutionary chiefs in the north laid down their arms, whilst General Caceres, the leader of the rebel troops, sent a conciliatory letter in January to President Iglesias. His proposals, however, could not be accepted, for they practically involved the recommencement of hostilities with Chili, whilst they stipulated for the immediate holding of a general election by means of which Caceres hoped to become President. He then set himself up as the champion of a constitutional government against a "foreign-appointed dictator," and despatched General Puga against the Government troops. A detachment of these was outflanked by General Puga, who seized upon the Customs House at Trujillo, and this victory brought the rebels a great number of new partisans. Chili, anxious on her own account for peace, saw that the best way to secure it was to strengthen the hands of General Iglesias as much as possible by national and constitutional methods. A Constituent Assembly was, therefore, convened (March 1) to elect him provisional President, and as soon as this was done, the treaty of peace was ratified (March 10) almost without discussion. This was the signal for a renewal of the conflict by Caceres, and the rebels were joined by ex-President Montero, who seized Huanuco and shot the Prefect. Shortly after, ratifications of the treaty of peace between Chili and Peru were formally exchanged, and the new Peruvian Government was recognised by England, France, Spain, Italy, and Holland. From May until July negotiations were carried on between Iglesias and Caceres, the former proposing a suspension of hostilities, political as well as military, until December, when a general election and a presidential election should be held, and he would himself retire into private life. But Caceres declared he could not trust his rival, and forthwith took the field again, ensconcing himself with his army in Chicla, and proclaiming himself Dictator. After varying success he entered Lima (August 27) with ninety horsemen, but after a stubborn fight he was driven back by the Government troops. After a few weeks of rest he managed to collect 1,300 disciplined soldiers at Trujillo, where he was attacked (October 10)

by the Government troops under Colonel Iglesias, brother of the President, and thoroughly defeated. But it was not until after seven hours' desperate street-fighting that the Plaza, the centre of resistance, was carried. The church towers had been converted into fortresses, and were filled with riflemen and others throwing hand grenades on the attacking troops, whilst the Town Hall had been strengthened on the outside by sheets of iron nailed to it. Quesada, who commanded the insurgents, was captured, and 300 men were killed on both sides. According to the original convention the last of the Chilean troops were to evacuate Peruvian soil on July 30, but the continued civil war caused a postponement of this step until September, and when that month arrived, the prospect of peace seemed as distant as ever. Although Caceres had the sympathy of many who smarted under the humiliating treaty that had been signed, his conduct was condemned as unpatriotic, for it was clear to everybody that Peru imperatively needed rest if she were to recover at all from the exhaustion of her war with Chili. The country, however, seemed to grow more tranquil after the capture of Trujillo, and by the beginning of December there was every prospect of a speedy termination to the intestine troubles from which Peru had so long suffered. The Government troops that had been sent to the north to operate against Colonel Seminario, who had established a centre of resistance at Ayabaca, were successful in dislodging him, and drove him and his followers in confusion towards the equatorial frontier. Dr. Puga, convinced that further efforts were useless, had finally left the field, and was desirous of a reconciliation with the Government. The important department of the Amazon had also proclaimed allegiance to the Government, the Prefect appointed by Caceres stating that after the disasters at Lima and Trujillo he saw the impossibility of continuing in arms, and counselled the people to submit. At Canete, 100 miles south of Lima, the Government troops had crushed the numerous bands of robbers and murderers who, under the guise of soldiers, had so long been devastating the district, and their leader was carried a prisoner in Lima. Ayacucho had been occupied on November 21 by Colonel Mas, the soldiers under Colonel Morales Bermudez, Caceres' commander, offering no resistance; whilst the battalion under Manuel Caceres mutinied and dispersed, the latter narrowly escaping assassination. Caceres, in the meantime without funds, was wearing himself out at Arequipa. No further revenue could be derived from the Mollendo Customs House, and the people of Arequipa and the vicinity were reduced to the depths of poverty. There was evidently no longer any sympathy manifested for the waning cause, and everybody was tired of the weary struggle.

A truce was agreed to between Chili and Bolivia on April 4 for an indefinite period, and this was ratified in the autumn by the Bolivian Congress.

Chili.—In Chili the Finance Minister reported that the national revenue for 1883 amounted to 44,248,695 pesos, and the expenditure to 41,553,918, whilst in the Budget estimates the expenditure for 1884, including war charges, was put at 44,256,753 pesos. Late in the year Admiral Lynch was selected as the new Minister of Chili at the Court of Madrid, his mission putting an end to a nearly twenty years' suspension of diplomatic relations. He had acted with great bravery as leader of the Chilian army in the recent war with Peru, and when that was over had governed Peru for four years as Dictator during the Chilian occupation, and retired only after handing over the government to Iglesias, whom he protected, moreover, for eight months against the revolutionists.

VI. CENTRAL AMERICA.—PANAMA, NICARAGUA, ETC.

Panama.—The construction of the canal made good progress during the year, upwards of 15,000 labourers being employed on it, and fresh arrivals from Jamaica were from time to time reported. An officer of the American navy, in his report on the works, had admitted their steady progress, but regarded its completion by the specified date (1888) as impossible. On the other hand, M. de Lesseps stated in Paris in July that the company would complete the canal without the assistance of Government, and that up to that time nothing had occurred to justify the assumption that any delay would arise.

At a meeting held in July in the city it was resolved that the President Cervera, having been impeached for bribery, must quit the Government palace; but on his refusal to resign, and in order to prevent disturbances, it was agreed that he should continue in office until his term expired, provided he consented to make certain changes in his Cabinet, and to meet other demands of the Opposition. This unsatisfactory arrangement soon broke down, Cervera resigned, and General Ruiz was proclaimed President in his place. This, however, was the signal for a fresh display of popular dissatisfaction, and the newly elected President having preferred abdication, Cervera was reinstated in the Presidency. In connection with the claims of the two rival Presidents an incident was reported, which at one moment threatened serious consequences. On October 14 a party of armed associates, led by General Ruiz, a man of restless courage, who had been concerned in the 1880 and other risings, having seized the British tug-boat *Morro*, obtained possession of and armed the Costa Rica steamer *Alajuela*. On the following day the President, accompanied by a small body of soldiers, went on board the *Morro*, bearing a flag of truce. The rebels, however, refused to parley, and attempted to ram the *Morro*; but failing in this, they fired a volley into her, which was returned, and a conflict began which

continued for ten minutes. The *Alajuela* then made good her escape, the *Morro* being unable to follow her, but claiming the victory, on the double ground of having silenced the enemy's fire, and of remaining possessor of the field. The day after the fight, the British ensign on the *Morro* was hauled down, and the Colombian flag hoisted in its place—an act which aroused considerable annoyance to the foreign residents. Diplomatic correspondence followed, and the owners of the *Morro* made a claim for damages, which was at once admitted by the authorities for the amount necessary for repairs, but beyond this point the negotiations had not reached at the close of the year.

Nicaragua.—The announcement that a treaty had been signed on December 1 between the Government of the United States and the republic of Nicaragua, for the construction of a canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, caused considerable amazement on both sides of the Atlantic. By the terms of this treaty the canal was to be constructed by the United States, but would be the property of both Governments jointly, the United States agreeing to protect the integrity of the territory of Nicaragua. The United States stipulated for the right to select the land route, as well as to construct a railway, which should be treated as part of the canal. A strip of land $2\frac{1}{2}$ English miles in width was to be set apart through which the canal would run. This strip was to be owned by both parties for canal purposes, but would be under the jurisdiction of Nicaragua. The United States were to have the free use of any land or waters which might be required for the construction of the canal. There were to be six official managers, three being appointed by each Government. In apportioning the tolls, Nicaragua was to get one-third, and the United States two-thirds. The latter Government formally disavowed any intention to impair the sovereignty of the Nicaraguan Government over the territory of their State. They desired, on the contrary, to strengthen the American republics, and would use their good offices, if desired, towards the promotion of the confederation of the five existing republics of Central America under one representative Government. The canal was to be constructed by the Engineer Corps of the United States army, after plans drawn up by Mr. A. G. Menscal, civil engineer of the United States navy; and it was to be a ship canal suitable for all the requirements of commerce. It was to begin at the port of San Juan de Nicaragua, or Greytown, ceded by Great Britain to Nicaragua in 1860, and to intersect the San Juan River above the Rio Colorado, thence continued by the river San Juan to Lake Nicaragua, and across that lake to the mouth of the river Del Medio, and thence to the Pacific Ocean at the harbour of Brito, a total distance of 180 miles. As the terms of this treaty were in direct violation of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850, which latter dealt expressly with a canal as now planned, it was obvious that a vigorous protest would be raised by England against the new treaty if ratified by

the Senate. Murmurs of opposition were also to be heard in the United States themselves against a scheme which would impose on the Federal Government very heavy financial responsibilities and novel political obligations. It was felt, however, that the acquisition of territory within the borders of a foreign State would be so alien to the national policy that it would be scarcely possible to inaugurate it on the eve of a great change in the United States administration.

CHAPTER VIII.

AUSTRALASIA.

I. AUSTRALIA.—*Victoria.*—The disappointment that followed the refusal of the British Government in 1883 to ratify the annexation of New Guinea was not lessened by their decision not to deal with Australian federation in the Imperial Parliament until the respective local Legislatures had taken the initiatory step. The basis of co-operative action was not hard to find. Each colony was beginning to recognise that additional power over the neighbouring islands of the Pacific would be necessary to protect the continent from the inroads of French *récidivistes*, or the convicts of any European Power which might found a penal settlement in the South Pacific. The feeling was so unanimous throughout the colony that the Acting-Governor, Sir William Stawell, stated in his speech at the opening of Parliament that, “should unfortunately the protest of the Australasian Colonies, the diplomatic action of the Imperial Government, and the unceasing exertions of my advisers and the Governments of the other Colonies prove ineffective, my advisers will be prepared to adopt such measures as the threatened danger may render necessary.” By a strange coincidence these words were uttered by the very man who more than thirty years previously had headed a demonstration of the colonists of Hobson’s Bay, which had successfully opposed the landing of two cargoes of English convicts. The third, and therefore the last, session of the triennial Parliament was opened by the Acting-Governor, who, after an expression of regret at the death of the Duke of Albany, referred to the federation of the Australian Colonies. He stated that since the arrival of the newly-appointed military officers from England a council of defence had been constituted, the enrolment of the Militia was steadily proceeding, classes for military instruction had been instituted, cadet corps were being formed, and rifle clubs established in many parts of the country. The fortifications recommended by Sir William Jervois were also in course of completion, and the new and powerful Colonial gunboats were on their way from Europe. Sir W. Stawell further stated that the recent harvest had been unprecedentedly abundant, that commerce was

expanding and industries progressing, and also that Commissioners for the management of railways and the public service had been appointed. Considerable railway extension was promised for districts not yet accommodated, and an amendment of the licensing system, embodying the principle of "local option," was contemplated. The Address in reply to this speech was carried without a division. By the middle of the year the original enthusiasm for Australian federation had considerably slackened, and there was even a rising opposition to the idea traceable in some quarters. Mr. Service, the Premier, was however strongly in its favour, and, as he had an overwhelming majority in the Assembly, there seemed but little danger of his failing to carry the Federation Bill. Caution was, however, needed, for, with the New South Wales Government hostile, the Tasmanian Government favourable but inactive, and the New Zealand Government apathetic, it would require all the tact of the Victorian Prime Minister to avoid anything that might look like dictation. Early in July, however, both Houses accepted without a division the resolutions passed in the previous year by the Sydney Convention, and voted an Address to Her Majesty praying for an Imperial Act to establish the Federal Council. The resolutions embraced—(1) Federation of the Colonies into an Australian Dominion, (2) annexation to the Dominion of New Guinea and other islands in the Western Pacific, and (3) protective legislation against criminal aliens. The concurrence of Tasmania had already been given, and Queensland and South Australia were expected to follow shortly. As it would be competent under the proposed federal powers for any four colonies to form an Australian Dominion, it was expected that the British Government would, in accordance with Lord Derby's promises, take such action as would bring the islands of the Western Pacific under Australian or Imperial authority. Sir Henry Loch, the new Governor of Victoria, in succession to the Marquess of Normanby, his arrival (July 15) at Melbourne was received with great cordiality, all the more enthusiastically expressed as he was believed to sympathise with Colonial aspirations; but no occasion arose during the remainder of the year for any marked display of feeling.

The only other Parliamentary incident worthy of remark was the Budget. Mr. Service, in introducing it (July 17), estimated the revenue for 1884-5 at 6,495,878*l.*, and the expenditure at 6,402,931*l.*, leaving a balance of 92,947*l.* to be carried forward to 1885-6. He, nevertheless, proposed an additional tax of two shillings a gallon on spirits, assimilating it to that of New South Wales, Queensland, and South Australia. The revenue returns for the year to June 30, 1884, showed that the income was 5,934,241*l.*, an increase of 332,176*l.* on the preceding year, and due almost entirely to the profits of the State railways.

The failure of the Oriental Bank during May, with half a million belonging to the Victorian Government in its hands in

London, was the only disastrous event in the financial history of the year. At Melbourne, the momentary excitement was so great as to cause a run upon other local banks; but confidence speedily returned when these showed themselves equal to the pressure put upon them. The decision of the Imperial Government in the autumn that there should be a Protectorate over only a limited portion of New Guinea and the adjacent islands, was received throughout Australia with a feeling akin to dismay, and the first impulse of a large body was to recall the guarantee of 15,000*l.* towards the cost of a New Guinea Protectorate. Calmer counsels at length prevailed; and although in many quarters it was loudly declared that both Colonial and Imperial interests had been sacrificed, it was at length recognised that the unannexed portion of Torres Straits was not altogether at the mercy of the first foreign Power who might desire to obtain a foothold on the shore. But the Australians had scarcely reconciled themselves to the limitations imposed by the British Cabinet on the New Guinea Protectorate, when the news arrived that Germany had annexed not only the more important islands of the Western Pacific, but even the northern portions of New Guinea.

Popular sentiment increased as time advanced and the truth became more fully known. It found its expression in the following memorandum addressed by the Premier of Victoria (December 20) to the Governor:—"The reported hoisting of the German flag not only in the Western Pacific, but also on the northern side of New Guinea, has already created consternation in this community. The surprise felt at this act is based, first, on the resolution of the Sydney Convention declaring that further foreign territorial acquisitions in the Western Pacific would be highly detrimental to the safety and well-being of Australasia; secondly, on the assurances contained in the despatch of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated May 9, in which confidence was expressed that no foreign Power contemplated any interference in New Guinea; and, thirdly, on the negative reply given by Mr. Evelyn Ashley in the House of Commons on October 24 regarding the reported understanding with Germany. Moreover, Lord Derby, on July 2 of last year, announced in the House of Lords that any attempt on the part of a foreign Power to settle on the coast of New Guinea would be regarded as an unfriendly act."

The sequel, as well as the explanation of the policy of the mother country, belong to the subsequent year's history.

New South Wales.—The attempt to settle the land question, to which the Government was deeply committed, obscured for some months all other political questions, and no opportunity was found for discussing in the Assembly the resolutions passed at the Sydney Convention. Moreover, as far as local interests were concerned, there was a strong opinion in the Colony that it would be more politic to abstain from federation for some years to come. New South Wales, although agreeing with the other Australian

produce 195,000*l.* yearly. The waste lands of the colony were also dealt with in measures of a most liberal and comprehensive character.

Queensland.—The principal legislation of the year was that dealing with various phases of the labour question. A bill to regulate the Polynesian labour traffic and forbid the sale of firearms and the payment of head-money; and another restricting Chinese immigration, by the imposition of a poll-tax of 30*l.* on every Chinaman entering the colony, and limiting the number to be carried by any vessel to any port in Queensland, were among the most noteworthy measures which became law.

The Governor, Sir Anthony Musgrave, on opening Parliament (July 11), announced that the Imperial Government had been urged to renew its protests against the deportation of French criminals to the Pacific, and that in the meanwhile a measure would be introduced into the Australian Parliament which would effectually prevent the landing of convicts on the shores of the colony. The questions of immigration and the supply of labour were, he added, seriously occupying the attention of the Government, and improved arrangements would shortly be completed for the selection of suitable immigrants in Great Britain and on the Continent, as well as for their conveyance to places where labour was most required. The labour traffic had been so grossly abused by slavers kidnapping New Guinea islanders and others, that it became necessary to adopt the most stringent regulations on the subject, whilst the recruiting of labourers in New Guinea or New Britain was absolutely prohibited. Later in the year a Scotchman named Neil McNeil was brought to trial for the murder of a South Sea Islander. The trial lasted four days, and there was evidence of the most shocking treatment of natives by McNeil and the crew of the *Hopeful*. He was condemned to death, but the sentence was commuted to penal servitude for life, because there was no positive proof that the man he shot had really died, though it was a moral certainty. The trial attracted considerable attention, and one peculiarity of it was that the evidence of natives was admitted for the first time. The annexation of New Guinea, on account of its proximity, engrossed even more attention in Queensland than in the neighbouring colonies. The news that Great Britain had proclaimed a limited Protectorate over the southern portion of the island raised a storm of indignation in Brisbane, and the British Government were loudly assailed in the Queensland Parliament for their timidity and want of determination. Bitter laughter was indulged in over what was called "the childishly theatrical display in Jackson's Harbour at Port Moresby. The investiture of a savage, attired in a red shirt and a white hat, with a silver-headed stick as the symbol of his deputy-lieutenanship of a country as large as France was too ridiculous for matter-of-fact colonists." Sir T. McIlwraith, ex-Premier, and now leader of the Opposition,

initiated the discussion in the Legislative Assembly on the recent attitude of the Imperial Government towards the Australian Colonies. He referred at length to Lord Derby's repudiation of the Queensland annexation in April 1883, and charged the British Government with ignoring the wishes of the colonists. He criticised the discrepancy between the proclamation of Deputy Commissary Romilly on October 26, and that of Commodore Erskine on November 6, declaring that the former brought the whole of New Guinea under the Protectorate of Great Britain except that portion claimed by the Dutch, whilst the other only subjected part of the southern coast to the supervision of the English High Commissioner. He was answered by the Premier, Mr. S. W. Griffith, Q.C., who urged that until it was really known what the Imperial Government had done, it was premature to express either satisfaction or dissatisfaction, and he counselled patience until the arrival of General Scratchley, who, as High Commissioner of New Guinea, would be possessed of the full views of the British Government. The debate was continued for some hours with great warmth and animation, revealing clearly the deep-seated feeling of discontent which existed in the colony on this question.

The depression in Northern Queensland arising from the threatened extinction of the sugar trade gave strength to the long-slumbering Separatist movement, and public meetings were held in the chief northern towns affirming the necessity of such a course. It was urged that, inasmuch as of the fifty-five members in the Legislative Assembly three-fourths were drawn from the sub-tropical and more thickly inhabited districts, it was impossible for tropical Queensland, with its vast territory and 1,500 miles of sea-coast, to have its wants fairly represented. The cleavage point of the two parties in the colony is the question of the introduction of coloured labour. The sugar planters of tropical Queensland declare they cannot exist without it; those who live in more temperate regions do not admit its absolute necessity.

Tasmania and Western Australia call for but slight notice. In the former the revival of the mining industry has died away almost as rapidly as it had sprung up some four years back, and the population, in spite of assisted immigration, remains almost stationary. The interests of the large landowners are opposed to the development of public works; and as they have long exercised a very preponderating influence in the elections, any change of policy is likely to be gradual. A step, however, in this direction was made during the year. Mr. Giblin, the Premier, who had held office since 1879, resigned, and was succeeded by Mr. Douglas, and a Constitution Act Amendment Bill, greatly extending the franchise, was at last passed. In Western Australia the sparseness of the population still constitutes the chief obstacle to the development of the colony. In the ten years just ended the

total increase according to official returns was only 5,000, making a total of 30,766 souls to a territory embracing one million square miles. The old convict population, too, seems to be rapidly passing away, for there remain of this class only 323 persons, including lunatics and invalids.

II. NEW ZEALAND.—The beginning of the year found the relations between the colonists and the King natives improving, and arrangements were in progress to open the whole of the interior of North Island—*i.e.* nearly 4,000,000 acres—to the Government surveyors, in order to determine the best routes for roads and railroads. The native owners of this territory were ready to concur in this policy if the lands were secured to them and their descendants absolutely, and if they were allowed to exercise a certain amount of authority in the country. The Native Lands Act was at the same time amended, so as to render penal all dealing with native land except through the machinery of the Native Lands Court. These arrangements were strongly supported by Mr. Boyce, the Native Minister, and it was satisfactory to all concerned that a solution had been attained without force or bloodshed. It was with reference to a more personal matter that Tawhiao, the Maori king, accompanied by four native chieftains, left Wellington (April) for England, to lay before the Imperial Government the grievances of the native population of New Zealand and to ask redress. His case was briefly this. After the death of his father he had been elected King of a new confederacy of New Zealand tribes, and his election as supreme chief was successful in promoting law and order. He admitted the suzerainty of the Queen of Great Britain, but his people resolutely asserted and jealously maintained their independence of the Colonial Government. In 1862 the latter attacked the King and his people, and drove them into the mountains, and their lands were confiscated and divided among the colonists. For nearly twenty years Tawhiao and his people lived unmolested among the mountains, enjoying that independence which they have claimed as their right. The Colonial Government were now about to open up his territory by means of roads, and, notwithstanding recent arrangements, this was regarded by the natives as a further encroachment. He repudiated any desire to assume the title of King of New Zealand, for, although the head of the Maori race, he unreservedly acknowledged the supremacy of the Queen. Finding no redress in the Colony, he determined to see what could be obtained from a personal appeal to his suzerain. His hopes in this direction, however, bore but little fruit. He was refused an audience of Her Majesty, and it was only on the eve of his return (July 22) that the Colonial Secretary (Lord Derby) consented to grant him an interview. The King, supported by certain English sympathisers, based his claim for redress on the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, and in the Memorial presented to the Government they asked—(1) that the Maories should be allowed to legislate for

themselves; (2) that a native chief should be appointed as commissioner by Her Majesty; (3) that the greater portion of the taxes levied on the Maories should be returned to them in order to provide for the expenses of government; (4) that the European judges in the Native Lands Court should be superseded by judges appointed by the natives; and (5) that the lands wrongly obtained by the Government should be returned to the Maories. The Memorial concluded with a prayer that the Queen "will confirm her words given in the Treaty of Waitangi, that it may not be trampled on by the Government of New Zealand in anything they may do to annul that treaty." Lord Derby, after hearing what Tawhiao and the other chiefs individually had to urge, replied cautiously, "We shall seriously consider and give our best attention to the complaints made, and when we hear what is said on the other side and what answer is given to these complaints, we will, as far as our power goes, endeavour to do justice." With this the memorialists had to be satisfied, and Tawhiao returned to his own country.

Meanwhile the New Zealand Parliament had been passing through stormy times. A vote of want of confidence in the Ministers having been carried, it was dissolved at once. The new elections resulted in the return of thirty-five Ministerialists out of ninety-one members. On the assembling of Parliament, as Major Atkinson was not strong enough to carry on the Administration, Sir Julius Vogel was entrusted with the formation of a new Ministry, which was of short duration. The Government programme was met by an amendment to the Address, which was moved and carried after a short debate by 52 to 33, and Sir Julius Vogel consequently resigned. A coalition Ministry was next attempted, composed of Sir Julius Vogel, Sir George Grey, and Major Atkinson, the last acting as Premier, but this arrangement was so short-lived that it could scarcely be regarded as having had more than a "paper" existence. The Governor then sent for Sir George Grey, but the latter, after communicating with Mr. Stout and Major Atkinson, relinquished the task, recommending that Major Atkinson should be commissioned to undertake the task. A Cabinet was, indeed, got together, but on the very first opportunity (August 29) Mr. Stout proposed a non-confidence motion, which was carried by 43 to 35, Sir George Grey and his followers voting against the Ministry. The task of forming an Administration then devolved upon Mr. Stout, who, with Sir Julius Vogel as Colonial Treasurer, succeeded in uniting a body of politicians who commanded the confidence of the majority. Sir Julius Vogel was not forgetful of his former success as Finance Minister, and his first statement showed that he had lost none of his former audacity. He proposed forthwith a conversion of the loans by which the Sinking Fund charges would be relieved and the interest reduced, rendering the reduction of property tax by one-half possible. He estimated the revenue for

the year at 3,850,000*l.* and the expenditure at 3,770,000*l.*, placing the surplus on the year's transactions at 60,000*l.*; but at the same time he gave notice of his intention to ask for authority to raise a further loan of 1,500,000*l.* He declared that in his opinion the finances of the colony were buoyant and elastic, and he looked forward to annual increases of revenue and reduced taxation. The House of Representatives in their final sitting (Nov. 10) resumed the long-suspended debate on the Federation resolutions. A motion was carried sanctioning the payment of New Zealand's share of the 15,000*l.* promised conjointly by the Australian Colonies towards the expense of the New Guinea Protectorate. The consideration of the Federal resolutions was, however, adjourned until the ensuing session, with a view to further negotiations with the other Australian Colonies on the subject.

III. PAPUA OR NEW GUINEA.—On this island, the largest in the world, equal in extent to Great Britain and France together, public interest has been concentrated throughout the year. Since April 1883, when the Queensland Government, under the belief that they were only just anticipating a foreign Power, suddenly annexed New Guinea, it has never been out of the thoughts of the Australians. The refusal by Lord Derby to ratify the act of the Queensland Government produced universal irritation and disappointment in the Australian Colonies; but his suggestion of a policy of common action on their part was seized upon at once, the colonists thinking the New Guinea question so pressing as to admit of no delay. The Sydney Conference followed at the close of 1883, and the project of Federation was warmly advocated by the representatives of the various Colonies. In August, it was announced in the British Parliament that Great Britain meditated a Protectorate over the southern coast of New Guinea, to the east of the region claimed by the Dutch Government, but that it would not include the islands to the north and east of New Guinea. It had already been notified to the British Government that all the Australian Colonies (except New Zealand, which was passing through a political crisis) would jointly secure to the Imperial Government a payment of 15,000*l.*, for the purpose of extending the jurisdiction of the High Commissioner of the Western Pacific over New Guinea, and that the Governments of Victoria and Queensland had jointly guaranteed the payment of the entire sum. The decision of the British Government as to the extent of the Protectorate in New Guinea declared (October 8) it to extend, "for the present," along the southern shore of New Guinea, and over the country adjacent thereto, from the 141st meridian of east longitude, eastward as far as East Cape, including any islands adjacent to the mainland in Goschen Strait, and to the southward of the said Straits as far south and east as to include Kosman Island. No persons were to be permitted to settle or acquire land within the Protectorate, unless expressly authorised by an officer of Her Majesty's Government. Directions were ac-

cordingly telegraphed to Commodore Erskine, of H.M.S. *Nelson*, then at Sydney, to hoist and salute the national flag at Port Moresby, and at any other points along the coast which he might think desirable. On November 5 the chiefs of the various tribes in the neighbourhood were assembled on board H.M.S. *Nelson*, off Port Moresby, and the Commodore explained to them the object and meaning of the Protectorate, the Rev. W. G. Lawes translating his address into the Motu dialect. To the chief of the village in Port Moresby, a man of eminence throughout the Motu district, was handed a silver-mounted stick with a coin-like head of Queen Victoria on the top. This was a recognised emblem of authority.

On the following morning a strong party of seamen and Marines were landed from Her Majesty's ships *Nelson*, *Espègle*, *Raven*, and *Harrier*, on the beach between the two parts of the native village. Commodore Erskine, accompanied by a numerous staff, disembarked about 8 A.M., and was received on landing by a guard of honour. He proceeded to the residence of the Rev. W. G. Lawes and the Rev. J. Chalmers, the well-known missionaries, and the result of whose labours astonishes everybody who visits this part of the world. Here the seamen and Marines were drawn up in order, forming an enclosure, in the middle of which was fixed a flagstaff. Mr. Chester, the resident magistrate of Thursday Island, was one of the party as the representative of Queensland, the official who in April 1883, acting under the instructions of the then Premier of that Colony, Sir Thomas McIlwraith, had crossed over to New Guinea and annexed it to Queensland. A lady was also present in the person of Mrs. Lawes; she had done more to win the natives of New Guinea to Christianity and civilisation than could have been thought possible. From the balcony of the Mission House, and surrounded by his officers and the persons above named, and Mr. Romilly, Deputy-Commissioner of the Western Pacific, the Commodore then read out the proclamation announcing the assumption of the Protectorate, and the Rev. W. G. Lawes translated it to the fifty chiefs seated on the ground just below him. This done, the flag was hoisted and saluted, and a similar ceremony was subsequently gone through at various places along the coast. Major-General Scratchley, R.E., was appointed Special Commissioner to control the Protectorate in New Guinea.

In December the German flag was hoisted on the northern coast of New Guinea and over the archipelago of New Britain. The news fell like a thunderbolt on the continent of Australia, and the British statesman who had permitted such a step to be taken was loudly condemned. It was perhaps in deference to this explosion of Colonial opinion that the British Government gave orders as the year was closing for an extension of the British Protectorate in New Guinea. Under this the Louisiade Archipelago and the north-east corner of the island from East Cape to the

F F

Gulf of Huon, together with the islands of that coast, would form part of our Colonial Empire.

IV. FIJI.—Labour in this colony is still its one imperative want, and this has now become so scarce that discontent prevails among all but the native chiefs. The settlers complain that the cause lies in the superfluous and meddlesome regulations enacted in the interest of those chiefs. Fijians make excellent labourers, and would gladly earn pay from the English planter, but they are forbidden to take hire from strangers except on terms they cannot satisfy in view of the compensatory dues demanded by their native chiefs. These chiefs retain much of their feudal sovereignty, and are recognised by the authorities as a sort of local nobility; the result is that they abuse their privileges and reduce their tribesmen to a state of slavery. Freedom of contract as between employer and employed is therefore unknown, and the Fijians become sulky and destitute, and the planters threaten to shut up their sugar-mills.

A large and enthusiastic public meeting of the white population held (September 16) at Levuka decided to lay their grievances before the Convention of the Australian Governments about to assemble at Sydney. They demanded amongst other things such a Government as that which existed in New South Wales before Parliamentary government was conceded. Failing this, the settlers would be content to be incorporated with one of the large Colonies. A petition to Her Majesty for a change in the form of government had already been forwarded; it was signed by 600 persons, and this number represented nearly the entire European population exclusive of foreigners and officials. Although the Europeans number only 2,500, and the natives muster 110,000, the latter contribute but one-fourth of the annual revenue.

PART II.

CHRONICLE OF EVENTS

IN 1884.

JANUARY.

1. An Orange demonstration took place at Dromore, co. Tyrone, in answer to a summons issued by the Nationalist party to assemble at that spot. Great precautions were taken by the police, and a large military force was brought upon the ground, and the two meetings were held separately, and their respective upholders kept apart. The excitement extended to Newry, Dungannon, and Derry.

— Mr. J. B. Tower, a clerk at Lloyd's, who had been attending a "watchnight" service at Stoke Newington, found dead near Green Lanes. It was first thought that he had been murdered, his body conveyed some distance from the supposed scene of the attack, and thrown into the New River Reservoir, but subsequently the theory of a suicide prevailed.

2. The Correctional Tribunal of the Seine sentenced the "Marquis" de Rays, the organiser of the Port Breton (New Hebrides) Colonisation Scheme, to four years' imprisonment, and his associates to various periods of imprisonment and fines.

— Terrible collision took place on the Canadian Grand Trunk Railway, near Toronto, in which twenty-two workmen on their way to work were killed and about thirty others seriously injured.

3. Meeting held at the Cannon Street Hotel, under the presidency of Lord Brabourne, to support the Association of Railway Shareholders. The object of the society was to combine railway shareholders in defence of their statutory rights, on the faith of which 700 millions had been subscribed and the whole railway system created.

5. An intensely cold wave moving eastwards reported from America. The mercury reported to be 27 degs. below zero at Cincinnati, 20 degs. at Chicago, 14 degs. at Cleveland, 24 degs. in Nebraska and Iowa, 45 degs. in Manitoba, and 48 degs. at Jamestown, Dakota. Several severe fires reported from various parts of the United States, and at Cleveland the Park Theatre and a Nunnery at Belleville, Illinois, where thirty lives were lost, burnt down; the firemen's work being greatly hindered by the intense frost.

5. Remains of Victor Emmanuel translated from their temporary resting place to the Pantheon at Rome.

6. Canford Manor, Dorset, the seat of Lord Wimborne, much injured and partially destroyed by fire.

— A bridge crossing the North-Western Railway near Coppull Station (between Wigan and Preston) fell upon the workmen beneath, killing the inspector and six workmen, besides injuring many others.

7. French statistics published, showing that the vintage of 1883 (36,090,000 hectolitres) was the largest in France since 1878, though still far below the average of the previous ten years (45 millions). In 1874 the area under vine cultivation was 2,446,000 hectares, against 2,095,000 in 1883.

8. The trade in frozen meat from the Australasian colonies, which had begun in 1880 with 400 carcasses of sheep, rose in 1883 to 193,645 landed in England alone, being 62,733 from Australia, and 129,732 from New Zealand. On the other hand the importation of frozen beef had fallen from 1,373 quarters in 1881 to 753 in 1883.

9. The first of a series of pilgrimages, composed of deputations from the various provinces and chief cities of Italy, assembled at Rome and went in procession to the tomb of Victor Emmanuel in the Pantheon. The number of delegates seeking to do honour to the late king's remains was so great that it was found necessary to arrange three processions for three different days.

— A duel fought at Paris between M. Aurélien Scholl and M. Dion, in consequence of an article by the former which had appeared in *L'Événement*. M. Scholl was wounded in the side, his adversary's sword snapping, and part remaining in the wound.

— Mr. Henry George, the author of "Progress and Poverty," addressed a crowded meeting at St. James' Hall on the Nationalisation of the Land.

10. Mr. S. Walker, the new Irish Solicitor-General, returned unopposed for Londonderry, in the place of Mr. Porter, raised to the Mastership of the Rolls in Ireland.

— It was stated that, owing to the threats made against his life, Mr. Justice Denman, who had pronounced sentence on O'Donnell, was guarded by police in plain clothes even when on the Bench.

11. General "Chinese" Gordon accepted a mission from the King of the Belgians to proceed to the Congo River, with the object of putting an end to the slave trade in the district of Niam Niam, whence the Soudanese slave-dealers draw their chief supplies.

12. The Thames Conservancy Board notified its intention to oppose the scheme of constructing a lock at Isleworth, on the ground that the grievances from the state of the river from which Richmond and Twickenham were suffering would only be shifted a little lower down the river.

— A pyramid measuring 4,350 ft. at its base and 750 ft. in height, reported to have been discovered in the virgin forest in the district of Sonora (Mexico), about four leagues from Maddalena. A short distance to the east of the pyramid was a small mountain, of about the same size as the pyramid, of which the rock was hollowed out into innumerable chambers, from 5 to 15 ft. wide by 5 to 10 ft. long, and 8 ft. high.

13. Dr. Price, of Llantrissant, "the last of the Druids," attempted to

cremate the body of his child in a bonfire on the summit of one of the neighbouring mountains. The police interfered and prevented the ceremony, but restored the child's body on the promise that it should be interred in the ordinary way.

14. Mary Robinson, known throughout London as "the Queen of the Costermongers," buried in Finchley Cemetery. In accordance with her directions her coffin was carried by four men wearing white smocks, and was followed by twenty-four young women wearing violet dresses, white aprons, and hats with white feathers. The deceased at one time kept a shop in Somers Town, and latterly sold cat's-meat, but her chief source of profit was lending money to costermongers; and it was reported that in this way she had amassed over 50,000*l.*

15. In the oil districts of Pennsylvania a well near Bradford overflowed the railway for above a hundred yards. A train coming up dashed through, and some coal from the engine setting fire to the oil, the hind part of the train was enveloped in flames. Six passengers were fatally injured and thirty others seriously burnt or maimed in their efforts to escape.

16. Mr. Barnum's so-called sacred white elephant arrived at Liverpool in s.s. *Tenasserim*, and subsequently conveyed to the Zoological Gardens, London, by rail. The animal bore the voyage and journey without apparent discomfort.

17. The warehouses of Messrs. Silver, outfitters, in Cornhill, totally destroyed by fire, which injured the adjoining buildings, including a part of the Merchant Taylors' Hall in Threadneedle Street.

— M. Palleron received at the French Academy, in succession to M. Louis Blanc. The "discours de réception" was delivered by M. Camille Roussel.

18. The *Clarence* reformatory ship, lying in the Mersey, set fire to by some of the boys, and completely destroyed. No lives were lost, but some of the boys engaged in the plot escaped.

— Wetham Hall, in the East Riding, the seat of Mr. R. A. Bower, burnt down.

— "Chinese" Gordon, having been reinstated in his rank in the British army, despatched suddenly to Egypt for service in the Soudan.

— The *City of Columbus*, 2,000 tons register, bound from Boston to Savannah, struck on a ledge off Martha's Vineyard Island, the most westerly part of Massachusetts; and out of passengers and crew numbering 120 only twenty-seven were saved, many being frozen to death after having escaped to the rigging of the stranded ship.

19. After a trial lasting six days the jury were unable to agree in their verdict as to the guilt of Wolff and Bonduraud, charged with conspiring to blow up the Geneva Embassy. It appeared that the conspiracy was rather to obtain the reward they expected would be offered for the discovery of the authors of the projected explosion. The trial was chiefly remarkable as being the first in which, under the new statute, a prisoner offered himself for examination.

20. Lusby's Music Hall and Temple of Varieties, situated in the Mile End Road, London, totally destroyed by fire.

21. The Court Circular announced that the Queen was still unable to remain standing for more than a few minutes at a time.

22. In the Queen's Bench Division Baron Pollock gave judgment in the case of Sir Percival Heywood v. the Bishop of Manchester. The Bishop had refused to institute Rev. H. Cowgill to the living of Miles Platting, to which Sir P. Heywood, as patron, had presented him. Mr. Cowgill had been curate to Mr. Green, against whom proceedings had been taken in the Court of Arches, and on his nomination to succeed Mr. Green, Mr. Cowgill had declined to give any assurance that the proceedings complained of, and pronounced illegal, would be discontinued.

23. A severe gale accompanied by rain swept over Ireland and the western counties of England, doing considerable damage to life and property. The recently erected church at Manorhamilton blown down.

24. Edmond About elected a member of the French Academy by 18 votes over François Coppée, who received 14.

25. At Vienna a detective officer named Bloch shot dead by a man who, when arrested after a desperate resistance, acknowledged himself to be the agent of a secret society, and was proved to be a complete stranger to Vienna.

— It was announced that Mrs. Stapleton Bretherton, of Ditton Hall, Lancashire, whom Pius IX. had created a Marchioness of the Roman Court, had bequeathed 400,000*l.* to Pope Leo XIII.

26. An agent of the Russian Secret Police, sent to Kharkoff to investigate a supposed Nihilist plot, found dead in his room stabbed with a poniard. It was stated that a correspondence had been discovered by him revealing a plot for poisoning the Imperial family by means of strychnine, to be used in making the bread for the use of the household, and for bringing about a rising of the peasants throughout Little Russia.

— Terrific gales swept over the Atlantic, the British Isles, and the coasts of Western Europe, extending destruction far inland, Paris especially suffering. In the Channel two large ships, the *Simla* and *City of Lucknow*, came into collision near the Isle of Wight; and for a time it was thought that the former ship had foundered, but she was ultimately brought into harbour a complete wreck.

28. A funeral service held at the Central Synagogue, Berlin, over the body of Dr. Lasker, the parliamentary leader of the Liberals, brought from America, attended by the President and Vice-President of the Reichstag, a number of ex-Ministers, and by about 5,000 persons.

— A sculling match for 200*l.* a side took place on the Thames (Putney to Mortlake) between Elliot, the Tyneside champion, and Bubear, of Putney. The latter was the favourite, and won easily by six lengths. Time, 30 min. 38 sec.

— Port of Spain, the chief town of the island of Trinidad, almost entirely destroyed by a fire, which, originating in the Union Club House, soon destroyed the whole of the south-eastern portion of the town, including the chief hotel and principal street. No fire brigade existing in the island, the flames could not be checked.

29. The failure of Messrs. Thomas, Sons, and Co., stockbrokers, for 800,000*l.* announced, followed by the subsequent issue of a warrant for the apprehension of the senior partner, Mr. Blakeway.

FEBRUARY.

1. The Nineteenth Annual Report of the Peabody Donation Fund issued, showing that to the amount originally given (500,000*l.*) there had been added for rent and interest 329,863*l.* 15*s.* 8*d.*, whilst of a sum of 390,000*l.* borrowed from the Public Works Loan Committee, 30,000*l.* had been repaid. At the close of 1883 the trustees had provided for the artisan poor 9,693 rooms, occupied by 18,009 persons, exclusive of bath-rooms, laundries, and wash-houses, at an average rent of 4*s.* 8½*d.* per week for each dwelling, or 2*s.* 1½*d.* for each room.

2. The floods in Derbyshire and other parts of the Midlands reported to have been more disastrous than any which had occurred since 1875. The cotton mills of Messrs. Smith at Belper had to be closed, and at Driffield the principal streets were under water. Round Wingfield, and as far away as Monmouth, the district was more or less flooded.

— The Bishopric of Chester declared to be vacant by the resignation of Dr. Jacobson on the ground of old age.

4. Free Schools in Water Colour Art, organised by the Royal Institute of Painters in Water Colours, opened at the studios attached to the Working Men's College, Great Ormond Street, London.

— Baker Pasha's force (3,500 strong), despatched to relieve the garrisons of the Soudan, completely routed and dispersed in its first engagement with the Arabs on the road to Sinkat.

5. The Fifth Session of the Tenth Parliament of Queen Victoria opened by Royal Commission.

— The *Gazette* announced that the Bishopric of Southwell, consisting of the counties of Derby and Nottingham, had been duly founded, the Bishopric of Lichfield and Lincoln having contributed 3,000*l.* towards its endowment.

7. The proprietor and members of the committee of the Park Club convicted at Bow Street of keeping a common gambling house and fined 500*l.* each.

— The bank rate of discount raised to 3½ per cent. from 3 per cent. at which it had remained since September 27 previous. Proportion of reserve to liabilities 40½ per cent.

9. The twenty convicts sentenced to various terms of penal servitude for the part they had taken in the Phoenix Park murders conveyed to Chatham Prison in consequence of the fears entertained by the Government of an impending attack upon Mountjoy Prison (Dublin), where they were undergoing their sentences.

— As a wedding party were crossing the river Theiss, near Domrad, in seven vehicles the ice gave way and the whole party, thirty-five in number, were drowned with the exception of one—a gipsy musician.

— Mr. Justice Stephen, in addressing the Grand Jury on the case of Dr. Price at Cardiff, declared that cremation was not prohibited by the English law, nor an indictable offence if carried out in a way which did not create a nuisance.

11. Serious floods reported from various parts of the Western States In Ohio, between Wheeling and Moundsville, 20,000 persons were said to be houseless. In Cincinnati the floods rose higher than in 1832, and from Cairo to New Orleans the Mississippi threatened to devastate large tracts of country.

13. Canon Stubbs appointed Bishop of Chester, in the place of Dr. Jacobson, resigned, and Dr. Ridding, Head Master of Winchester College, to be the first Bishop of the newly-created diocese of Southwell.

15. A meeting held at the Guildhall, presided over by the Lord Mayor, to protest against the vacillating and inconsistent policy of the Government in Egypt.

— The mail train from Dumfries to Kircudbright left the rails a few miles beyond Castle Douglas, and fell over a wooden bridge, by which a wide moss is traversed. The guard escaped, but the engine-driver and stoker were crushed to death. There were no other passengers.

16. Catherine Flanagan and Margaret Higgins sentenced to death at Liverpool for the murder of Thomas Higgins (the latter prisoner's husband), by arsenic, after having effected insurances on his life. There were several other charges of a similar nature against the prisoners.

— Mr. C. Elton, of Whitestaunton Manor (Conservative), returned for West Somerset by 3,757 votes, against Lord Kilcoursie (Liberal), 2,995.

18. At the Liverpool Assizes the six lads belonging to the reformatory ship *Clarence* who pleaded guilty to having set fire to her were each sentenced to five years' penal servitude.

19. Mr. Bradlaugh re-elected for Northampton by a considerably increased majority on a larger register, the numbers being—Bradlaugh 4,032 ; Richards (Conservative), 3,604.

— A terrific cyclone swept over Georgia and Alabama, causing widespread destruction of both life and property. It was estimated that at least 300 persons were killed and 5,000 houses wrecked.

20. Mr. Clare Sewell Read returned without contest for West Norfolk, in the room of Mr. George Bentinck, resigned.

— The ship *Aurora*, arriving from America with kerosene, caught fire at her moorings at Garden Reach, Calcutta, occasioning great alarm to the surrounding shipping. A greater danger was experienced when the ship broke up and such of the 30,000 cases of oil as remained unconsumed were floated up the stream towards the city and ships.

21. François Coppée chosen by the French Academy as successor to Victor de Laprade by 24 votes against 9 given to M. Émile Montégut ; and M. de Lesseps as successor to the historian Henri Martin by 22 votes, against 11 blank votes.

— Mr. W. T. Marriott, Q.C., Liberal M.P. for Brighton, having voted against the Government on the Vote of Censure, applied for the Chiltern Hundreds, and the writ for a new election moved by Lord Richard Grosvenor, the Ministerial whip.

22. At the Altcar Coursing Meeting the Waterloo Cup won by Mr. J. Mayer's w. bk. d. Greenstick. The Waterloo Purse divided between Mr.

J. Evans' Escape and Mr. R. Jardine's Gladys, and the Waterloo Plate won by Mr. J. R. Marshall's Cocklaw Dean.

22. The river Dee, near Chester, flowed at 6.40 A.M., and after two hours' ebb began to flow again, rising 3 ft., when at 9.30 it ebbed again.

23. Mr. John Deary, the Nationalist candidate, returned for the city of Cork by 2,150 votes, against 1,153 given to Mr. Goulding (Conservative).

25. Sir H. Brand formally retired from the Speakership of the House of Commons, after having held the office since 1872.

26. About 1 A.M. an explosion took place in the cloak-room of the Victoria Station of the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway. The neighbouring offices were wrecked, the glass roof was shattered, and very much damage done by the shock, as well as by the fire which ensued from the bursting of the gaspipes. The cause of the explosion was attributed to a package deposited in the cloak-room about 8.30 P.M., supposed to contain dynamite, and fulminated by a clockwork infernal machine.

— Mr. A. W. Peel, M.P. for Warwick, youngest son of Sir Robert Peel, the eminent statesman, elected Speaker of the House of Commons without opposition.

27. It was discovered that at both Charing Cross and Paddington Stations portmanteaus containing large charges of dynamite, with clockwork detonators, had been deposited in the cloak-room. The clocks were so set that, had the plot been successful, the three explosions at Victoria, Paddington, and Charing Cross would have been simultaneous. Subsequently it was also discovered that in the same evening a portmanteau, similarly charged, had been left at the cloak-room of the Ludgate Hill Station of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway.

29. General Graham, with about 4,000 troops—chiefly British—attacked the Mahdi's lieutenant, Osman Digna, at Trinkitat, and, after four hours' severe fighting, defeated him with the loss of 38 officers and men killed and 142 wounded.

MARCH.

1. Mr. Brock's bust of Longfellow unveiled in Poets' Corner of Westminster. The bust was presented by Lord Granville to Canon Prothero, officiating for the Dean.

— Three trains came into collision on the Caledonian Railway near Forfar; but although great damage was done to the road and rolling stock, and many passengers and officials were injured, no actual loss of life occurred.

— The polling at Brighton resulted in the re-election of Mr. Marriott as a Conservative by 5,478 votes, against 4,021 given to Mr. Romer, Q.C., who as a Liberal was supported by the party which had returned Mr. Marriott at the General Election.

3. A great fire occurred at Utica, New York State, in which a bank, a school, a newspaper office, and public buildings, to the value of 800,000 dol., were destroyed.

4. A Royal Commission appointed, with Sir Charles Dilke as Chairman, to inquire into the housing of the working classes. Among the Commissioners were the Prince of Wales, Cardinal Manning, Lord Salisbury, Mr. Goschen, and Mr. Broadhurst.

6. A duel fought with swords at Campo Grande, a suburb of Lisbon, between Major Serpa Pinto, the African explorer, and the Visconde Roboredo. The latter received five wounds.

7. The Crown Linoleum Works in Lambeth totally destroyed by fire.

— An infernal machine, consisting of a box in which were dynamite and other explosives, and addressed to the Comte de Paris, handed into the railway parcels office at the Lyons station. Suspensions having arisen as to the address of the sender, the box was carefully opened by the officials, and its contents ascertained; but the commissioner who brought it to the station could give no clue to the person from whom he had received the box. The affair afterwards proved to be a hoax.

8. Vice-Chancellor Bacon gave judgment for the defendant in the case of the London Financial Association *v.* Kelk, which had lasted twenty-nine days, and in which forty counsel were engaged. The main object of the suit was to prove that the original direction of the company had in 1865 or previously exceeded the powers of the Association. The amount which the existing company sought to recover was about 400,000*l.*

9. Dr. Shapira, who had offered for sale to the British Museum an alleged manuscript of the Old Testament for 1,000,000*l.*, committed suicide at an hotel in Rotterdam by shooting himself through the head with a revolver.

10. Sculling race for 200*l.* a side between Wallace Ross, of St. John's, New Brunswick, and George Bubear, of Putney, resulted in the easy defeat of the Thames sculler, although he had received ten seconds start. The winner's time from Putney to Mortlake was 26 min. 30 sec.; Bubear's 38 sec. longer.

11. Lord Tennyson, whose robes had been stolen some days before, took his seat in the House of Lords—introduced by the Duke of Argyll and the Earl of Kenmare—both of whom sit as barons.

— The Home Secretary, Sir William Harcourt, in reply to a deputation from the metropolitan vestries, declined to ask Parliament for sanction to interfere with itinerant showmen and owners of caravans.

12. Rev. W. A. Fearon, Head Master of Durham School, chosen to succeed Dr. Ridding as Head Master of Winchester College, where he had previously been Assistant Master.

— The French troops under General Négrier entered Bacninh after a comparatively short struggle, the Tonquinese troops retiring in confusion.

13. An explosion took place in a colliery at Pocahontas, Western Virginia, whereby 120 miners—all who were in the pit—lost their lives. Houses at a considerable distance were wrecked by the shock.

— General Graham gained an important and hardly contested victory over Osman Digna, capturing his entrenched camp at Tamasi.

— Bank of England reduced its rate of discount from 3½ to 3 per cent., the proportion of the liabilities to the reserve, 1,510,900*l.*, being 43½ per cent.

14. Mr. E. A. Freeman appointed Regius Professor of History in the University of Oxford, in succession to Canon Stubbs.

15. The House, having met contrary to its custom at noon (Saturday), remained sitting until quarter before six on Sunday morning, a long debate upon Egypt having preceded the discussion of the Supplementary Estimates.

— A conspiracy having for object the seizure of the King of Spain discovered at Madrid, and the principal agents arrested at the house of General Velarde.

— E. Weston completed his walk of 5,000 miles in as many consecutive hours (Sundays and Christmas Day excluded), having during its course traversed the greater part of England, delivering lectures daily in the cause of temperance.

17. The Court of Appeal, composed of the Master of the Rolls and Lords Justices Baggallay and Lindley, gave judgment in the case of *Belt v. Lawes*, confirming the verdict of the jury by whom 5,000*l.* damages had been awarded to the plaintiff, and reversing the order of the Queen's Bench Division by which the damages had been reduced to 500*l.*

— A numerously attended meeting held at the Mansion House, under the presidency of the Lord Mayor, to protest against the enormous increase of the School Board rate in the City of London.

18. The degree of M.A. *honoris causa* conferred upon Bunyiu Nanjio, a Buddhist priest from Japan, who had been at Oxford for some time studying the Sacred Books.

19. A monument bust, erected at St. Olave's, Hart Street, City, in memory of Samuel Pepys, unveiled by the American minister, Mr. Lowell, acting for Lord Ashburton, First Lord of the Admiralty, in the presence of a numerous assembly.

20. The election of a member for Cambridgeshire, in the place of the late Speaker (called to the House of Lords as Viscount Hampden), resulted in the return of Mr. T. H. Thornhill (Conservative) by 3,915 votes over Mr. T. Coote (Liberal), who polled 2,812 votes. This was the first contested election for that county since 1868, and under the Ballot Act.

21. In the House of Lords Lord Thurlow's motion for opening the National Collections of the Metropolis on Sundays defeated by 48 to 36 votes, and in the House of Commons Mr. Willis's resolution to relieve the bishops from their attendance in the House of Lords, opposed by Sir W. Harcourt, as the spokesman of the Government, negatived by 148 to 137.

— The vacancy at Huntingdon, caused by the succession of Lord Hinchbrook to his father's peerage, filled by Sir Robert Peel (Conservative), who defeated Mr. Veasey (Liberal) by 455 to 446 votes.

22. At a meeting of the Committee of the Fisheries Exhibition, it having been reported that after paying all the charges and expenses there remained a surplus of 15,243*l.*, it was resolved that 10,000*l.* should be voted to a fund for helping families who had suffered the loss of a husband or father in the prosecution of his calling as a sea-fisherman, and 3,000*l.* should be applied towards the formation of a Fisheries Society.

28. His Royal Highness the Duke of Albany (Prince Leopold), who had

been staying at Cannes for the benefit of his health, slipped on leaving the Club Nautique, injuring himself so much that he died a few hours afterwards (3 A.M.)

28. The Grand National Steeple Chase at Liverpool won by Mr. H. F. Boyd's Voluptuary, 6 yrs., 10 st. 8 lb., defeating a field of 15 starters, including the favourite, The Scot, belonging to the Prince of Wales, and run in his name. Time 10 min. 5 sec. Course about $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles.

29. Serious rioting reported from Cincinnati, originating in a belief that justice was corruptly administered. A man named Berner, who had murdered his employer, having escaped with a sentence of imprisonment only, public indignation became excited, a mass meeting was called, after which an attack was made on the gaol. A stubborn defence was made; the militia, and subsequently troops, were sent for. The numerous attacks by the populace were beaten off, but with great loss of life, 38 dead bodies and 52 severely wounded persons having been removed to the morgue and hospital at the close of the day's fighting; but the total casualties before order was restored, after three days' disturbance, amounted to nearly 250.

31. Sir Henry Brougham Loch appointed Governor of the colony of Victoria, and General Sir J. Lintorn Simmons to be Governor of Malta.

— In consequence of the sudden illness of the Speaker (Mr. Peel), the Deputy Speaker (Sir A. Ottway), and the Chief Clerk (Sir T. Erskine May), the House of Commons narrowly escaped an adjournment for want of a properly qualified president. The Deputy Speaker, however, managed to leave his bed and to attend; but was quite inaudible when putting questions, &c., to the House.

APRIL.

1. At a meeting of the City Commissioners of Sewers it was resolved, *nem. con.*, to refer to the Sanitary Committee the question of erecting a proper crematorium at the Ilford Cemetery.

— Prince Bismarck's entry into his seventieth year was accompanied by the announcement that he intended to resign the Presidency of the Prussian Ministry, and the portfolios of Foreign Affairs and Commerce in the Cabinet, retaining only the post of Imperial Chancellor.

— Severe cyclones raged over a wide extent of country in Ohio, Indiana, Tennessee, and Western Pennsylvania. Twelve persons were reported to have been killed and fifty seriously injured. The town of Oakville, Indiana, was entirely destroyed, whilst much damage was done at Pittsburg and Chattanooga.

2. Mr. Edmund Yates, editor of the *World* newspaper, sentenced to four months' imprisonment for a libel on the Earl of Lonsdale. He was allowed to stand out on bail pending an appeal.

— A fire broke out in Paternoster Row which rapidly extended into Newgate Street on the one side and almost into St. Paul's Churchyard on the other. Forty houses and establishments, including Messrs. Blackwood's, were more or less injured. The total damage was estimated at over 30,000*l*.

3. The Prince of Wales, bringing with him the body of the Duke of Albany from Cannes, reached Portsmouth from Cherbourg at 7 P.M., and landed without ceremony.

3. The Belgian White Cross Line steamship *Daniel Steinman*, from Antwerp to New York, struck on the rocks off Sambro Head, Nova Scotia; and out of passengers and crew numbering 140 persons only nine were saved.

— Bank of England reduced its rate of discount from 3 to 2½ per cent.

4. The remains of the Duke of Albany brought from Portsmouth to Windsor and deposited, after a funeral service, in the Albert Memorial Chapel.

5. The State funeral of the Duke of Albany took place at Windsor, the body being removed from the Albert Memorial Chapel to the royal vault under St. George's Chapel. All the crowned heads in Europe were represented by members of their families or by high officers of State. The Queen was present in the choir, and the Prince of Wales acted as chief mourner.

— An extraordinary attempt made to set fire to the village of Cark, near Barrow-in-Furness. The alarm was first received at the Post Office, where it was discovered that a large quantity of paraffin had been poured on the floor of the shop. Scarcely were the flames brought under when it was discovered that another post office in a different part of the village had been similarly set on fire. A grocer's store and a beershop were next attacked, and much damage done; it was also discovered that the doorways of the principal inn and of a large mill had likewise been saturated with paraffin.

7. The forty-first University boat-race, postponed on account of the Duke of Albany's funeral, rowed in the presence of the smallest number of spectators known for years. Oxford, having won the toss, selected the Surrey side, and the start was made shortly before noon. Cambridge, rowing 39 strokes a minute, at once showed in front; and although Oxford started at 40 strokes their boat was half a length behind at Bishop's Creek, and three quarters at Craven Cottage. Here the Cambridge stroke fell to 36, but at the Crab Tree their boat was a full length in advance. On turning the corner the Oxford crew got the advantage of their position and drew up close to their opponents, but the spurt died away, and Cambridge passed under Hammersmith Bridge (7 min. 29 sec.) more than a boat's length in advance. Their boat, however, being rather widely steered, gave Oxford another chance off Chiswick Eyot; but the Oxford rowing and steering had by this time become ragged, and after another spurt Cambridge passed the Bull's Head and Barnes Bridge (16 min. 50 sec.) nearly two lengths ahead. From this time Cambridge had the race in hand, reaching the winning post, just below Grove Park, in 21 min. 39 sec., about three lengths in advance of their antagonists. The two crews were composed thus:—

CAMBRIDGE.		OXFORD.	
	st. lb.		st. lb.
1. R. G. Gridley, Third Trinity (bow)	10 7	1. A. G. Shortt, Christ Church (bow)	11 3
2. G. H. Eyre, Corpus	11 3½	2. L. Stock, Exeter	11 0½
3. F. Straker, Jesus	12 3	3. C. R. Carter, Corpus Christi	12 12½
4. S. Swann, Trinity Hall	13 3	4. R. W. Taylor, Lincoln	13 3½
5. F. E. Churchill, Third Trin.	13 2½	5. D. H. M'Lean, New	13 0½
6. E. W. Haig, Third Trin.	11 8½	6. A. R. Paterson, Trinity	13 6
7. C. W. Moore, Christ's	12 0	7. W. C. Blandy, Exeter	10 12½
F. J. Pitman, Third Trin.		W. D. B. Curry, Exeter	
(stroke)	11 12	(stroke)	10 5
C. E. Biscoe, Jesus (cox.)	8 5	F. J. Humphreys, Brasenose (cox.)	8 0½

8. Serious riots took place at Kidderminster in consequence of certain employers, whose workmen were on strike, having imported weavers from other parts of the country. Considerable damage was done and many persons were seriously injured. Order was at length restored by the arrival of a cavalry regiment, which patrolled the streets.

— In the Inter-University athletic sports, which took place at Lillie Bridge, Oxford won in six contests. Putting the weight, Ware, 38 ft. 6 in. 100 yds. race, Cortex, $10\frac{3}{4}$ sec.; one mile, Pratt, 4 min. $26\frac{1}{2}$ sec.; quarter mile, Paine, 51 sec.; three miles, Toler, 15 min. 24 sec.; throwing the hammer, 107 ft. 4 in., Cambridge won; high jump, Colbourne, 5 ft. 10 in.; long jump, Grabham, 20 ft. $11\frac{1}{2}$ in.; hurdle race, Pollock, 16 sec.

14. The Volunteers, instead of being brought together in one body at Brighton, as in previous years, assembled at Dover, Aldershot, and Portsmouth, at each of which places reviews and sham fights were held. Marching columns started from Canterbury and Petersfield to attack the positions held by the troops forwarded by train to Dover and Portsmouth.

15. Heavy rains having washed away the trestle bridges on the Western Atlantic Railroad, Georgia, two trains were wrecked, and subsequently caught fire, six people being killed and eighteen injured.

16. Celebration of the Tercentenary of the foundation of the University of Edinburgh commenced, and attended by delegates from the principal universities of Europe and by numerous persons distinguished in literature and science.

17. A letter from Queen Victoria to the nation published, thanking her people for their sympathy with her and her daughter-in-law in their afflictions.

— Mr. W. J. Harris (Conservative) returned for Poole, in the room of Mr. C. Schreiber, by 877 votes against Mr. Clark (Liberal), who polled 815 votes.

— Three men, supposed to be connected with the recent dynamite outrages, arrested—Denman, *alias* Dalby, at Birkenhead, Francis Egan at Birmingham, and Patrick Fitzgerald in London.

18. Waltham Cross Railway Station, on the Great Eastern Railway, completely destroyed by fire.

— The barque *Ponema*, of New Brunswick, came in collision with the *State of Florida*, a large steamer, about 1,200 miles from the coast of Ireland. Both vessels sank almost immediately, only thirty-five persons being saved out of a total of over 180.

20. The Duchess of Edinburgh gave birth to a daughter at Eastwell Park.

22. An earthquake of considerable violence passed over the Eastern Counties, Chelmsford, Ipswich, and Colchester. Two churches (those of Langenhoe and Peldon) were seriously injured and the spires of two Congregational churches were thrown down. The centre of the disturbance was in the neighbourhood of Wivenhoe, but the area of disturbance extended from London in the south to Lincolnshire in the north. In some of the suburbs of London great alarm was occasioned by the rocking motion of the earth, which, according to various computations, lasted from six to twenty

seconds ; and the superintendent of the Palace of Westminster, who was on the top of the Victoria Tower at the time, declared that the tower rocked four inches out of the perpendicular. The total damage done was estimated at 20,000*l.*, for which a public subscription was opened.

22. At the Epsom Spring Meeting the Great Metropolitan Stakes, 2 miles, won by Mr. Lefevre's Zadig, 3 yrs., 5 st. 7 lb. Time, 4 min. 28 sec.

23. The "Bell Tavern," in the Old Bailey, a very old building, burnt down, three women, who slept upon the premises, losing their lives.

— At Epsom the City and Suburban Handicap (1½ mile) won by Lord Bradford's Quicklime, 5 yrs., 7 st. 5 lb. Time, 2 min. 10 sec. Twenty-one ran.

24. A very brilliant display of Aurora Borealis seen in the north of Scotland.

25. Canon Stubbs consecrated Bishop of Chester at York Minster.

— The new church of the Oratorian Fathers at Brompton opened with an imposing ceremonial by Dr. Bagshawe, Roman Catholic Bishop of Nottingham, assisted by Bishops Patterson, Withers, and many other distinguished ecclesiastics. The first stone of the new church was laid in 1880, and the building, at the cost of 100,000*l.*, was erected from designs by Mr. H. A. Gribble. Amongst the internal ornaments was a splendid marble retable and altar (dated 1683), purchased by the Fathers at Brescia.

26. A fire (the third within eighteen months) broke out at Messrs. Whiteley's establishment in Westbourne Grove, and burning fiercely for six hours completely destroyed three newly erected buildings (in Queen's Road) and property valued at 250,000*l.*

— A railway bridge over the Alendia River, on the Ciudad Real line, gave way whilst a train conveying a number of passengers (principally troops) was passing. The engine and carriages fell into the water, five-and-twenty feet below, and upwards of a hundred persons were said to be missing. The accident, it was asserted, was caused by the removal of the rails and the sawing asunder of the supports of the bridge.

29. Lord Falmouth's stable of racehorses sold at Newmarket, when thirty-six lots realised an average of 1,518 *gs.* each. Amongst them was Harvester (Sir John Willoughby), sold for 8,600 *gs.* ; Busybody (Mr. Baird), 8,800 *gs.* ; Louisbourg (Mr. Cloete), 4,000 *gs.* ; and Armida (Lord Hastings), 3,200 *gs.*

— At Oxford the admission of women to certain degree examinations, and the regular classification of the results, was sanctioned in Convocation by 464 votes against 321, the fullest poll known during the previous thirty years.

30. Prince Louis of Battenberg married at Darmstadt to Princess Victoria, eldest daughter of the Grand Duke of Hesse and grand-daughter of the Queen of England. Soon afterwards the Grand Duke himself married privately andmorganatically Madame de Kolemene, *née* Countess Hurten Czapaki.

— In the House of Commons Dr. Cameron's Bill for legalising cremation, supported by Sir L. Playfair and opposed by the Government, negatived on second reading, 149 to 79.

— At Newmarket the Two Thousand Guineas Stakes, R.M., won by Mr. Foy's Scot Free, 3 yrs., 9st. Time, 1 min. 48 sec.

MAY.

1. Dr. George Ridding, first Bishop of Southwell, and Dr. Sydney Linton, Bishop of Riverina, New South Wales, consecrated in St. Paul's Cathedral by the Archbishop of Canterbury and several assisting prelates.

— Several powerful dynamite cartridges discovered in the Parliament Building at Toronto.

2. The One Thousand Guineas Stakes at Newmarket, R.M., won by Mr. Abington's Busybody (the favourite), 8 st. 12 lb. Time, 1 min. 47 sec. Six started.

3. The failure of the Oriental Bank, which at one time occupied a leading position throughout India and China, announced.

5. A severe thunderstorm, accompanied by very vivid and remarkable lightning, broke over London about 2 P.M., lasting for upwards of an hour.

6. At the Annual Meeting of the Church Missionary Society, held in Exeter Hall, the President, the Earl of Chichester, stated that the income of the Society for the previous year had been 200,372*l.*—nearly 10,000*l.* increase on the previous report. The ordinary expenditure had amounted to 208,066*l.*

7. The Earl of Shaftesbury unveiled in the presence of a large assembly the statue erected on the Thames Embankment to William Tyndale, the first translator of the New Testament, through the energy of Mr. J. Macgregor, and supported by the British and Foreign Bible Society. The statue, by Mr. J. E. Boehm, cost, with its pedestal, 2,400*l.*

— The Earl of Carnarvon, acting as Deputy-Grand Master of the Provincial Masons, relaid the first stone of the tower of Peterborough Cathedral, which had been taken down in order to be rebuilt.

— The Chester Cup won by Mr. C. J. Merry's Havock, 6 yrs., 7 st. 10 lb., beating ten others, 2½ miles. Time, 4 min. 11½ sec.

8. National Health Exhibition opened at South Kensington by H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, acting on behalf of the Prince of Wales. One of the most interesting features of the Exhibition was the reproduction in a street of a number of well-known houses of Old London.

9. A meeting of the City ratepayers, held at the Guildhall, to discuss the Bill for London Municipal Government, and presided over by the Lord Mayor, had to be dissolved in consequence of the noisy and riotous conduct of those assembled.

— The sale of the Hamilton Library concluded, having realised in all 12,893*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* The Beckford Library, previously sold, had fetched 73,551*l.* 18*s.*, whilst in addition the manuscripts were sold to the Berlin Museum for 100,000*l.*

10. Two cases of suicide in Hyde Park reported as having occurred within twenty-four hours, and in both cases by persons who had previously been in good circumstances—one a stockbroker and the other a former proprietor of *Bell's Life*.

12. Kraszewski, a Polish poet of distinction, and a Captain Hensch, for-

merly in the Prussian service, placed on their trial before the High Court at Leipzig, on the charge of having furnished particulars respecting military armaments, fortifications, &c., to foreign Governments. In the course of the trial a letter from Prince Bismarck to the War Minister was read, in which the German Chancellor said that "since 1864 there has existed at Paris a Polish military society, which keeps a table of statistics relative to the principal armies of Europe. This society has for its object the re-establishment of a kingdom of Poland, and, with this purpose in view, it seeks to bring Poles who are serving as officers in the German, Austrian, and Russian armies into relations with it. In 1873 Colonel Samuel, of the Statistical Office of the French War Department, endeavoured to form an alliance between the Polish officers of the above-mentioned armies. In 1877, however, that office was done away with, and Gambetta commissioned an individual named Wolowski to establish an office which would collect information on military matters connected with the armies of the three empires. The headquarters of this office was at Dresden, and Kraszewski was entrusted with the duty of paying the agents. While at Pau, Kraszewski had relations with Colonel Samuel, and was presented by him to M. Jules Ferry, who promised him the decoration of the Legion of Honour. When the news of Kraszewski's arrest reached Paris, General Thibaudin, then War Minister, caused a domiciliary visit to be made by the police at the house of Baron Erlanger, under the pretext of the latter's complicity in the affair of the Union Générale, but in reality because he was suspected of being an agent of the German Government. Gambetta had charged the brother of Wolowski, who was at Vienna, to furnish him with military information." All these statements were formally contradicted by the French authorities. Nevertheless after a trial which lasted an entire week both the prisoners were found guilty, and Captain Hensch was sentenced to nine years' penal servitude and Kraszewski to three and a half years' confinement in a fortress.

14. In the House of Commons after a long debate the second reading of the Channel Tunnel Bill, moved by Sir Edward Watkin but opposed by the Government, rejected by 222 to 84.

— The difficulties in which many speculators on the New York Stock Exchange were involved culminated in a financial panic, which involved the stoppage of two or three banks and the bankruptcy of half-a-dozen large firms of brokers.

15. At the Albert Hall the "Shakespearian Show" was opened lasting four days. Eleven of Shakespeare's plays, illustrated with scenic effects, each with a proscenium of 16 ft., took the place of stalls, where all sorts of articles were sold for the benefit of a charity. The whole scene was backed by a view of Stratford-on-Avon Church.

— A part of the tunnel at the Denmark Hill Station fell in, blocking the traffic on both the London, Chatham, and Dover and London and Brighton lines during the greater part of the day. The accident was caused by the giving way of four iron girders supporting the roadway carried over the lines.

16. The Stadttheater at Vienna caught fire in the early morning, and completely destroyed in the course of a few hours. No performance was going on, and, with the exception of some injuries sustained by the firemen, no loss of life was reported, but about a dozen persons were injured.

16. Rev. Boyd Carpenter, Canon of Windsor, appointed Bishop of Ripon.

— Lord Randolph Churchill re-elected Chairman of the National Union of Conservative Associations, a post which he had resigned a short time previously.

17. A petition presented by the Duke of Marlborough to the Court of Chancery for permission to sell the Blenheim heirlooms, chiefly pictures by old masters, valued at 400,000*l*.

— Serious fire broke out in Liverpool among the cotton warehouses at North End, and an enormous destruction of property ensued.

19. In a billiard match at Cambridge between Mitchell and W. J. Peall, the latter, having won the match (1,000 up), continued the break, and scored 1,989 points, including 548 consecutive spot strokes.

20. The Hybrid Committee of the House of Commons, presided over by Colonel Stanley, M.P., rejected the Parks Railway Bill, for the construction of a line from Edgware Road, under Hyde Park and St. James' Park, to Westminster.

21. The Duke of Marlborough, subject to the leave of the Court of Chancery, offered to the National Gallery twelve of the finest pictures of the Blenheim Gallery for 420,000*l*., or five for 173,250*l*., but the offer was declined by the Treasury.

22. The race for the championship of the world and 1,000*l*. between E. Hanlan, of Toronto, and E. C. Laycock, of Sydney, took place over the Nepean River (N.S.W.), resulting in the victory of Hanlan by half a length.

23. The House of Lords' Committee, having declared the preamble of the Bill for making the Manchester Ship Canal proved, intimated their intention of allowing it to pass, with the proviso that 5,000,000*l*. should be raised before the work was undertaken. It was estimated that the proceedings before the Committee had cost the promoters and opponents an aggregate of over 150,000*l*. The inquiry lasted forty-one days.

— The monument erected in Westminster Abbey to the memory of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe unveiled by Earl Grosvenor.

24. Foundation stone of the St. George's Memorial Church at Berlin laid by the Crown Princess of Prussia.

— The Marylebone Cricket Club at Lord's defeated the Australians in one innings, scoring 481 runs to 184 and 182 obtained by the Colonials.

— Fire broke out in one of the pits of Middrie Collieries, near Portobello, causing the suffocation of twelve men.

— Prince Albert Victor of Wales made his maiden speech at a meeting of graduates and undergraduates, held at the Guildhall, Cambridge, in support of the settlement of University men from Oxford and Cambridge in the east of London.

26. In the cricket match between the Australians and an English eleven the latter scored 82 in their first innings and 26 in the second; whilst the Australians, having scored 76 in the first, lost six wickets in the second innings before winning the match, which was concluded in one day.

— The marriage of the Hereditary Prince of Anhalt to the Princess

Elizabeth of Electoral Hesse celebrated at the Castle of Philipparuhe in the presence of a number of crowned heads and princes.

27. "General" Mite, 22 in. high, and Miss Millie Edwards, 19½ in., known as the American "Midgets," married at the St. James' Hall, Manchester, by the minister of the Scottish National Church in that city.

28. The race for the Derby at Epsom terminated in a dead heat between Mr. Hammond's St. Gatien and Sir J. Willoughby's Harvester, neither of which was among the favourites in the betting. The first favourite, Queen Adelaide (also belonging to Sir J. Willoughby), two lengths behind the winners, who divided the stakes, was third. Fifteen started. Time, 2 min. 46½ sec.

29. The Epsom Grand Prize, 1½ mile, for three-year-olds, won by Mr. Cloete's Cherry, 8 st. 12 lb. (F. Archer), 2 min. 12½ sec. Fourteen started.

30. At about a quarter-past nine in the evening an explosion of dynamite took place in the St. James' Square area of the Junior Carlton Club, and almost simultaneously another charge was exploded in front of Sir Watkin Wynn's house, on the west side of the Square. Great damage was done inside the club-house, as well as to the Army and Navy Club, Adair House, in which the Intelligence Department of the War Office is located, Winchester House, and to the surrounding buildings. Some half-a-dozen servants were injured, but beyond this the destruction was limited chiefly to the smashing of window-panes in all directions. A minute or two later a still more violent explosion took place in Scotland Yard: the Criminal Investigation Department, and especially that portion allotted to the newly-created Political Branch, bore the brunt of the shock, and a very considerable portion of that corner of the building was much damaged. The public-house "The Rising Sun," however, in the opposite corner, was completely wrecked by the force of the explosion. One policeman was hurt and a few cabmen and horses bruised as well as frightened, but no loss of life ensued. About an hour later some boys discovered at the base of the Nelson Monument a black bag, containing sixteen cakes of dynamite and an extinguished fuse.

— The Oaks Stakes at Epsom won by the favourite, Mr. Baird's Busybody. Time, 2 min. 49 sec. Nine ran.

JUNE.

3. A railway accident, causing the loss of four lives and serious injuries to upwards of sixty persons, occurred on the Salisbury and Wimborne Railway between Downham and Breamore. When crossing the river Avon the whole train except the two engines left the rails, whilst running round the curve at the rate of forty miles an hour.

— Mme. de Kolomine signed at Berlin the legal Act, annulling her morganatic marriage with the Grand Duke of Hesse, on the payment of 500,000 marks by the latter; the lady, a descendant of Ulrich von Hutten, resuming her maiden name of Countess Czapska.

4. The East London Aquarium, Shoreditch, to which a menagerie and waxwork exhibition were attached, caught fire, which before it could be extinguished involved the loss of several of the animals and birds, as well as

the waxworks, Marwood's (the late hangman's) implements and pictures, and a number of the models, &c., purchased when the Polytechnic Institution was closed.

5. The remains of Sir Bartle Frere interred in the crypt of St. Paul's Cathedral, in a vault adjoining Captain Cook's, and within a few yards of Nelson's monument.

— Prince Heinrich von Hanau, son of the Elector of Hesse-Cassel and grand-nephew of the German Emperor, received into the Roman Catholic Church by the Papal Nuncio at Paris.

6. At the National Republican Convention held at Chicago, Mr. Senator Blaine, after four ballots, obtained such a decisive majority over his competitors that he was unanimously adopted as presidential candidate of the Republican party. The voting at the fourth ballot was—Blaine, 544 votes; Arthur, 207; Edmunds, 41; Hawley, 15; Logan, 7; and Lincoln, 2.

7. Whilst the Continental goods train was taking in water at the Seven-oaks Station, on the South-Eastern Railway, it was run into by the "market-garden" train from Deal to London, travelling at the rate of forty miles an hour. The driver and stoker of the foremost engine of the Deal train were killed on the spot.

— An attempt made to wreck the Dover express near Rochester Bridge Station, on the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway. A rail was placed across the line, which the engine driver perceived, and at once put the train at full speed, and cut the obstacle to pieces. A boy named Pearse was subsequently taken into custody and committed for trial on the charge.

8. Grand Prix de Paris won by the Duc de Castrie's "Little Duck" in a field of eight starters. Time, 3 min. 37 sec.

— A large Nationalist meeting, attended by over 3,000 persons, held at Newry; a counter demonstration by the Orangemen was frustrated by the Government despatching 1,500 troops besides numerous police to the spot. Rioting, however, took place in the evening, but no lives were sacrificed.

9. At Berlin the German Emperor, accompanied by his sons and other members of his family, laid the foundation stone of the new Houses of Parliament. Prince Bismarck, the Secretaries of State, and other high officials attended the ceremony, which was most brilliant.

10. At Vienna the anarchist Hermann Stellmacher convicted of the murder of the detective Blösch, and with complicity in the murder of the money-changer Eisert, and condemned to death.

— Riots took place both at Brussels and Antwerp when the defeat of the Liberal candidates in those towns was made known. Much damage was done, and many persons were injured.

11. One of the tunnels in course of construction on the new Asturian line fell through, causing the death of twelve workmen.

— The Albert medal of the Society of Arts awarded to Captain James Buchanan Eade, a distinguished American engineer, for his labours in improving the water communications of North America.

13. Disgraceful proceedings occurred at Lichfield, and were renewed on the two following nights, in connection with the annual assembly of the Royal Staffordshire Yeomanry. The disturbances originated in an attack

made by the Yeomanry in the theatre on many of the actors and actresses, the latter having to take refuge below the stage. On the second night the statue of Dr. Johnson in the market-place was insulted and disfigured, and on the third (Sunday) the colonel commanding, W. Bromley-Davenport, dropped down dead from heart disease, aggravated, it was said, by his abortive efforts to restore peace.

13. At Ascot the principal races were decided as follows :—

Gold Vase.—Mr. Hammond's St. Gatien, 3 yrs., 8 st. 4 lb. (C. Wood), 2 miles, 3 min. 42 sec. Four ran.

Coronation Stakes.—Duke of Westminster's Sandiway, 3 yrs., 8 st. 10 lb. (F. Archer), 0 M., 1 min. 52½ sec. Four ran.

Royal Hunt Cup.—Mr. R. Jardine's Acrostic, 4 yrs., 6 st. 5 lb. (F. Barrett), N.M. Sixteen ran.

Gold Cup.—Duke of Portland's St. Simon, 3 yrs., 7 st. 7 lb. (C. Wood), 2½ miles, 4 min. 32 sec., by twenty lengths. Five ran.

Hardwicke Stakes.—Mr. Lefevre's Tristan, 6 yrs., 9 st. 12 lb. (F. Webb), 2 min. 40 sec. Five ran.

Alexandra Stakes.—Mr. Manton's Corrie Boy, 6 yrs., 9 st. 4 lb. (F. Archer), 3 miles, 5 min. 9 sec. Three ran.

14. Mr. Joseph Ruston (Liberal) elected member for Lincoln City by 3,234 votes, over Mr. Richard Hall (Conservative) 2,263, in the room of Mr. J. Hinde Palmer, Q.C. (Liberal).

— At Jerez seven men condemned for the Socialist outrages of the *Mano Negra* executed by the garotte, three executioners being employed. Fourteen men had been originally condemned, but of these five had their sentences commuted, one went mad, and one turned informer.

15. The marriage of the Princess Elizabeth of Hesse to the Grand Duke Sergius Alexandrovitch took place at St. Petersburg, at the Winter Palace. A gorgeous ceremonial was observed, and the assembled company included representatives of all the European reigning families; but the most stringent precautions were taken by the police, and the streets through which the procession passed were under strict surveillance.

16. Immense swarms of caterpillars reported to have made their appearance in the mountainous districts of East Glamorganshire, especially between Greater Rhondda and Maesteg. The insects were brown, with black longitudinal stripes, and about an inch and a half in length. Millions were found buried in peat holes, gutters, and mountain brooks.

18. At an early hour in the morning an explosion took place in the Calle Sevilla, one of the principal streets of Madrid. A bomb had been concealed in a doorway, and on exploding occasioned considerable damage to the surrounding buildings, but none to human life.

— The Tercentenary of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, celebrated.

19. The Fountaine collection of faience, enamels, &c., concluded, after lasting four days, and realised 91,112*l.* 17*s.* for 565 lots.

— An anti-Jewish riot, resulting in the death of nine Jews and injuries to many others, as well as a great destruction of property, took place at Kunarvin, a village near Nijni-Novgorod, where the rioters, chiefly labourers, were waiting for the opening of the great fair.

20. In South Hants the vacancy caused by the retirement of Lord Henry Scott (Conservative), filled by General Fitzwygram (Conservative), who polled 4,209 votes, against 2,772 given to Mr. W. H. Deverell (Liberal).

20. In Mid Surrey the election resulted in the return of Alderman Sir John W. Ellis (Conservative) by 7,645 votes over Mr. Stern (Liberal), 4,949.

21. Floods reported from Galicia and Eastern Europe generally. The inundation extended over the whole Polish plain—the town of Cracow appearing as an island in the midst of a vast lake. The Vistula at Warsaw and numerous smaller rivers of Russian Poland overflowed their banks. Large works and enormous quantities of crops were swept away, and great damage effected to property, and serious loss of life occurred.

— On the concluding day of the Northern Lawn Tennis Tournament at Liverpool the Messrs. E. and W. Renshaw defeated the American champions, Messrs. Sears and Dwight, and thus became the absolute holders of the champion cup which they had won three years in succession.

22. The survivors of the Greely (U.S.) expedition to the North' Pole, which had been missing since 1881, and in search of which three expeditions had been sent, rescued off Cape Sabine by the United States' exploring vessels *Thetis* and *Bear*. Lieutenant Greely and six companions—one of whom died soon afterwards—were the sole survivors of the party of twenty-five who had started. A horrible charge of cannibalism was subsequently made against some of the survivors.

23. An outbreak of cholera reported at Toulon. As soon as the news transpired that some twenty persons had died during the previous week a panic pervaded the town, and upwards of 8,000 persons left in the course of the day to escape infection.

24. Mr. Justice Hawkins and Mr. Justice Smith gave judgment in the case of the Park Club, St. James', which had been described as a common gaming-house kept open for playing an unlawful game, *baccarat*. The judges confirmed the conviction (already pronounced) of the proprietor and four committee-men, but held that the conviction of the three players (also convicted) could not be maintained.

25. Rev. Dr. Hornby, Head Master, promoted to be Provost of Eton, in succession to Dr. Goodford, deceased.

— A great and rapid-spread of small-pox throughout the metropolis reported, the number of patients in hospital establishments having suddenly risen to 1,328.

— The trial of thirty-six Socialists for treason and attempting the life of the Emperor of Austria took place at Grätz, and concluded in the acquittal of all the prisoners on the more serious charges, and their conviction on the minor count of conspiring to disturb the public peace. Only short terms of imprisonment were inflicted.

26. The Paris *Figaro* published letters exchanged between Prince Victor Napoleon and his father, according to which the former, having promised to take no political step in opposition to Prince Napoleon, nevertheless announced his intention on May 19 of residing in a separate house to his father, being in the possession of an independent income of 40,000 francs. The source of this income was variously attributed to the bequest of a wine-grower in Champagne and to a collection made at the instance of M. Jellibois amongst the parliamentary and other adherents of the young Prince.

28. The representatives of the Great Powers summoned to confer upon Egyptian affairs met in London at the Foreign Office, and elected Earl Granville president.

— The Leigh Court Gallery of pictures, the property of Sir Philip Miles, sold by auction by Messrs. Christie, Manson, and Co., realising 44,296*l.* 7*s.*

— A water main of the New River Company burst in Upper Clapton, near to Lea Bridge Road, throwing the roadway up into a cone thirty feet high and more than twenty feet in circumference. The tramway was rent asunder and large pieces of concrete, weighing 2 or 3 cwt., were hurled in all directions, shattering glass and damaging the neighbouring houses.

30. The case of the Attorney-General *v.* Bradlaugh for the recovery of a penalty of 500*l.* for sitting and voting in the House of Commons without having complied with the requisite formalities concluded after five days' trial and some adjournments, by a verdict which was entered in favour of the Crown. Mr. Bradlaugh's trial "at bar" was conducted before the Lord Chief Justice (Coleridge), Mr. Justice Grove, and Baron Huddleston.

— The Theatre Royal, Edinburgh (which had been only rebuilt about ten years) entirely destroyed by fire in the course of the afternoon. The flames broke out in the property room underneath the gallery.

— Sale of the second portion of Lord Falmouth's racing stud took place at Newmarket, sixteen yearlings realising 18,350 *gs.*, and the five stallions, twenty-four broodmares, and eleven foals 57,090 *gs.* The total proceeds of the two sales thus exceeded 110,000*l.*

JULY.

1. The result of the North Warwickshire election showed a majority of 1,744 in favour of Mr. P. A. Muntz, the poll being—Muntz (Conservative), 5,282; Corbett (Liberal), 3,538.

— The University Cricket Match resulted in the favour of Oxford. The score was as follows:—

CAMBRIDGE.

First Innings.		Second Innings.	
Mr. C. W. Wright, b Whitby	16	c Kemp, b Page	34
Mr. H. W. Bainbridge, l-b-w, b Whitby	2	c Kemp, b Bastard	29
Mr. J. E. K. Studd, c and b Bastard	4	c and b Buckland	28
Mr. P. J. de Paravicini, b Whitby	37	b Whitby	10
Mr. D. G. Spiro, c and b Whitby	10	b Bastard	0
Hon. J. Mansfield, b Page	18	b Whitby	5
Mr. J. A. Turner, b Whitby	1	b Whitby	1
Mr. F. Marchant, l-b-w, b Whitby	0	b Bastard	0
Mr. C. W. Rock, c Nicholls, b Bastard	8	c Kemp, b Page	56
Mr. C. A. Smith, not out	0	not out	0
Mr. H. G. Topham, b Bastard	6	c Kemp, b Whitby	0
Byes, 8; l-b, 1	9	Byes, 9; l-b, 4; w, 1	14
Total	111	Total	177

OXFORD.

First Innings.			Second Innings.		
Mr. T. R. Hine-Haycock, b Rock	. . .	40	not out	. . .	35
Mr. J. H. Brain, c and b Smith	. . .	42	b Rock	. . .	0
Mr. T. C. O'Brien, b Bainbridge	. . .	0	b Rock	. . .	0
Mr. H. V. Page, b Turner	. . .	25	c Turner, b Topham	. . .	38
Mr. M. C. Kemp, c Smith, b Rock	. . .	2	not out	. . .	3
Mr. K. J. Key, run out	. . .	17			
Mr. L. D. Hildyard, st. Wright, b Turner	. . .	2			
Mr. E. H. Buckland, b Bainbridge	. . .	18			
Mr. B. E. Nicholls, c Marchant, b Topham	. . .	35			
Mr. E. W. Bastard, b Smith	. . .	17			
Mr. H. O. Whitby, not out	. . .	3			
Byes, 5; 1-b, 1; w, 1; n-b, 1	. . .	8	Byes, 3; w, 1	. . .	4
Total	. . .	209	Total	. . .	80

Umpires—West and Farrands.

2. Miss Müller, a member of the London School Board, and a prominent advocate of Women's Suffrage, having refused to pay her taxes (on the ground that taxation was the basis of representation), a distraint was made on her goods, and furniture to the value of 19*l.* was seized by the sheriff's officers and sold to cover the claim.

— At a place called Cunningham near St. Louis the railway bridge over the river gave way when a train was passing, and the engine and six cars fell forty feet into the water, occasioning the loss of fifteen lives.

3. The 700th anniversary of the incorporation of the city of Winchester, celebrated by a succession of *fêtes* and religious services extending over two days.

4. The principal races of the Henley Regatta were decided as follows :—

Grand Challenge Cup.—London Rowing Club (Berks Station), Eight oars.
 Visitors' Cup.—Third Trinity Boat Club (Berks Station), Four oars.
 Public Schools Challenge Cup.—Derby School (Berks Station), Four oars.
 Wyfold Challenge Cup.—Thames Rowing Club (Berks Station), Four oars.
 Stewards' Challenge Cup.—Kingston Rowing Club (Berks Station), Four oars.
 Diamond Challenge Sculls.—W. S. Unwin, Magd. Col. Oxf. (Bucks Station).
 Ladies' Challenge Plate.—Eton College (Bucks Station), Eight oars.
 Thames Challenge Cup.—Twickenham Rowing Club (Berks Station), Eight oars.
 Silver Goblets.—J. E. Lowndes and D. E. Brown, Twickenham (Berks Station), Pair oar.

5. The Prince of Wales, presiding at the festival of the Railway Guards Friendly Society, took the occasion of his first appearance at a public dinner to express, in the name of the Queen and the Royal Family, their thanks for the public sympathy shown on the death of the Duke of Albany.

7. A strike among the spinners at Bradford, extending to a large number of mills, followed by a strike of 500 weavers at Preston, and 3,000 miners at Dowlais.

— The action brought by Mr. Cornwall, Secretary of the Dublin Post Office, against Mr. O'Brien, M.P., editor of *United Ireland*, for libel, resulted in a verdict for the defendant, and practically gave confirmation to the offences with which the defendant had charged the plaintiff.

8. The will of H.R.H. Prince Leopold, Duke of Albany, dated April 1882, sworn under 46,000*l.* personalty; the whole of which the testator bequeathed to his wife for her own absolute use and benefit.

8. Mr. Holt Hallett and party, after a journey through North Siam, lasting five months and thirteen days, reached Bangkok from Moulmein.

9. The Supreme Tribunal of Hesse (Darmstadt) decreed a separation in the case of themorganatic marriage of the Grand Duke of Hesse and Mme. de Kolomine.

— A great fire broke out in the Royal Armoury at Madrid, situate in a wing of the old Alcazar. The building was almost destroyed, but the most valuable of the contents—of great historical and art interest—were saved.

10. The tercentenary celebration of the death of William the Silent commenced at Delft by a solemn service in the church, followed by the opening of an exhibition at the Prinzenhof, where he was murdered.

11. The annual cricket match between Eton and Harrow commenced at Lord's. In consequence of the bad weather the match could not be resumed. The first day's play gave the following results :—

HARROW.

First Innings.		Second Innings.	
Mr. E. M. Butler, 1 b w, b Martin	9	c Mordaunt, b Scott	31
Mr. F. H. Oates, c Forster, b Mordaunt	31	b Martin	6
Mr. W. H. Dent, b Martin	0	b Thomas	35
Mr. C. D. Buxton, c Phillipson, b Mordaunt	0	b Scott	13
Mr. A. K. Watson, c Soames, b Mordaunt	1	c Mordaunt, b Forster	20
Mr. C. E. Kindersley, b Martin	21	b Martin	6
Mr. W. A. R. Young, not out	23	not out	35
Mr. M. J. Daughlish, c Scott, b Martin	0	not out	5
Mr. C. H. Dent, c Phillipson, b Scott	22		
Mr. A. R. Cox, b Martin	13		
Mr. A. D. Ramsay, b Martin	1		
Byes, &c.	5	Byes, &c.	1
Total	126	Total	152

ETON.—First Innings.

Mr. H. Phillipson, c Young, b Ramsay	1
Mr. F. A. Soames, b Ramsay	1
Mr. R. J. Lucas, b Ramsay	3
Mr. F. Thomas, b Ramsay	6
Lord George Scott, b Buxton	32
Mr. H. J. Mordaunt, b C. H. Dent	3
Mr. H. W. Forster, c Watson, b Buxton	23
Mr. C. E. Murdock, c and b Buxton	0
Mr. T. H. Barnard, b C. H. Dent	4
Mr. W. C. Bridgeman, not out	4
Mr. E. G. Bromley Martin, b Buxton	0
Byes, &c.	5
Total	82

12. The National Democratic Convention assembled at Chicago, after a preliminary ballot—in which Governor Cleveland received 392, and Senator Bayard 170, whilst the remaining 250 were scattered among eight other candidates—ultimately decided to make Governor Cleveland the party candidate for the Presidency by 683 votes against 81 votes given to Mr. Bayard. Mr. Hendricks, his chief opponent, was subsequently unanimously selected for the Vice-Presidency.

— The Orange celebrations throughout Ulster were observed with great pomp, and attended by large numbers of persons from all parts of the three

kingdoms. In Ireland and in Scotland (in the neighbourhood of Glasgow) the Protestant demonstration passed off without any serious breach of the peace, but at Cleaton Moor, a mining centre of West Cumberland, serious disturbances took place, during which one of the assailants of the Orange procession was shot dead, and many of them were hurt and wounded.

12. The Prince and Princess of Wales laid a memorial stone in the new bridge at Putney, intended to replace the wooden bridge built in 1729.

13. A disturbance took place at Rome, in the neighbourhood of the Vatican, on the occasion of an attempt by the Clericals to celebrate the anniversary of the removal of Pope Pius IX.'s body from St. Peter's to San Lorenzo. An anti-Clerical meeting was held in the route of the procession and some rioting ensued.

— At Barmen, near Elberfeld, the lightning struck a circus where a performance was going on, killing four persons and severely injuring seven others.

14. The Paris National *fête*, although reduced to very insignificant proportions in consequence of the fear of cholera, gave rise to an unfortunate misunderstanding. The flags of all nations having been displayed at the Hôtel Continental, the mob insisted on the removal of the German flag, and forthwith broke all the windows of the hotel, and committed other outrages on property.

15. The contest for the Lawn Tennis Championship and All England Challenge Cup took place at Wimbledon. The competitors were Mr. W. Renshaw, who had held the Championship since 1881, and Mr. F. Lawford, the Irish Champion and winner of this year's Wimbledon Gold Prize—who had defeated Mr. Grinstead, the previous victor, in a contest with Mr. E. Renshaw. In the struggle for the Championship Mr. W. Renshaw won the first set by six games to love, the second by six games to four, and the third by nine to seven.

16. A terrible accident occurred to an express train on the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln Railway near Penistone. Whilst running at the rate of fifty miles an hour, the right-hand axle-bar of the engine suddenly snapped. The engine, tender and a horse-box left the line, ploughing up the road for about 400 yards, and breaking the chairs in the way. The rest of the train, consisting of seven composite carriages, was thrown over the embankment above thirty feet high and adjoining the bridge by which the Thurlstone road is crossed. All the carriages were overturned and three of them reduced to splinters. Nineteen passengers were killed on the spot—six died subsequently—and above fifty more were seriously injured.

— An attempt made to blow up with gunpowder the statue of Sidney Herbert, Lord Herbert of Lea, in the market-place of Salisbury.

17. The funeral of the late Prince of Orange, celebrated with great pomp. The procession left the palace at the Hague for Delft, where, at a new church, the service was performed and the coffin placed in the Royal crypt.

— The quincentenary of the death of Wycliffe, celebrated in his native village of Wycliffe near Barnard Castle.

18. Two policemen shot whilst attempting to take two burglars into

custody in the neighbourhood of Hoxton. One of the burglars was seized at once, but his companion approached the constables, and after firing four or five shots, ran off, and climbing to the roof of a neighbouring house, held his assailants at bay for some time. He was, however, at length secured, but only after having been rendered nearly senseless by a blow from one of the police.

19. A posthumous son born to H.R.H. the Duke of Albany at Claremont.

20. During the greater part of the afternoon water-spouts were seen off Southwold on the coast of Suffolk; one of very considerable size about five miles out to sea.

— A collision took place off the south-west coast of Ireland between two ships of the reserve squadron whilst exercising at steam-tactics. At the close of the manœuvres the *Defence*, instead of dropping astern, brought her bows on to the hull of the *Valiant*, striking her with her ram. The *Valiant* lost one Nordenfeldt gun, one cutter, boats &c., and had a large part of her bulwarks torn away. The *Defence* carried away her jib-boom and foretop-gallant mast, and a hole eleven feet long by half a foot wide was made in her ram; her foremost compartment filled with water, and she had to fix a collision mat over the leak.

21. A great demonstration of artisans and labourers, variously estimated from 25,000 to 66,000, assembled from various parts of London on the Thames Embankment and marched thence to Hyde Park, where resolutions were passed at seven platforms demanding the extension of household suffrage to the counties, and condemning the action of the House of Lords.

— Mr. Alfred Wills, Q.C., of the Midland Circuit, appointed one of the judges of the High Court, in the room of Mr. Justice Williams, and sworn in before the funeral of his predecessor.

22. A collision took place off Corunna (Cape Finisterre) between the Spanish steamer *Gijon*, which had 118 passengers and 77 officers and men on board, and the British steamer *Laxham*. The former struck the *Laxham* amidships, causing her to founder almost immediately; the *Gijon* keeping afloat a few minutes longer. A Spanish gunboat rescued above fifty persons from the two ships, but the remainder were drowned.

23. The cricket match at Lord's between England and Australia resulted in the victory of the former, in one innings (379), with 4 runs to spare, the Australians scoring 229 and 145.

— A strong shock of an earthquake, accompanied by subterranean rumblings, felt at Forio, in the island of Ischia.

— St. Paul's School, removed from its original site in the City of London and rebuilt at Hammersmith, at a cost of 100,000*l.*, from designs by Mr. Waterhouse, R.A., opened by the Lord Chancellor (Selborne).

— The National Union of Conservative Associations held its annual conference at Sheffield under the presidency of Lord Randolph Churchill, who was subsequently elected (at the head of the poll with 346 votes) a member of the Council for the ensuing year.

28. Numerous arrests, amounting it was said to over 250 within the fortnight, took place at Warsaw in consequence of certain papers found in

11. Great storms, followed by disastrous floods, reported to have burst over Central Europe. In Upper Hungary one village (Zebegeny) was wholly swept away and enormous damage was done throughout the country.

— At a fire at the Belgrave Hat Depôt in Wilton Road, Pimlico, the contents of the shop burnt so rapidly, that five of the inmates lost their lives.

— The thermometer at the Greenwich Observatory registered 93° in the shade, and 150°·8 in the sun's rays.

— A bicycle-race for ten miles, between Lees of Sheffield and Hawker of Leicester, was won by the former by one foot only in 29 min. 20 sec.

12. After some days of remarkable heat, during which numerous deaths from sunstroke were reported, thunderstorms occurred very generally over the British Isles. They were most severe in the north of England and in Scotland, where many lives were lost (including that of the Earl of Lauderdale, struck whilst riding on his pony, shooting), and great damage done both in the towns, especially Edinburgh, and in the Lowlands.

— During the night the statue of the Duke of Wellington, previously taken to pieces, removed by Messrs. Pickford in a specially constructed waggon drawn by six (afterwards ten) horses, from Hyde Park Corner to Aldershot.

13. The cricket match at Kennington Oval between England and Australia resulted in a draw—very much in favour of the Colonials, whose first innings lasted until 5 P.M., in which they scored 551 runs; England scoring, first innings, 346, and 85 in the second with two wickets down.

— Mr. Tremayne (Conservative) elected for South Devon, without opposition, in the place of Mr. J. C. Garnier.

— The authorities of the Heidelberg University declined to accept an offer of 5,000*l.* conditionally on the privilege of the University being thrown open to women.

14. Parliament prorogued by Royal Commission, having, since its assembling on February 5, held—House of Lords, 95 sittings, House of Commons, 128. The work of the session may be thus tabulated :—

	Government Bills	Private Members' Bills
Royal assent	54	27
Passed House of Commons . .	1	3
Withdrawn	27	106
Sent to select committees . .	1	5
Negatived	0	7
	<u>83</u>	<u>148</u>

— At Kasan (Russia) the powder magazine and five Government offices blown up, involving the loss of 100 lives; and a dynamite shell found under the windows of the central police station. The authorities had received a fortnight previously an anonymous warning from the Nihilists.

15. General Brine crossed the English Channel in a balloon from Hythe, descending at Havelinghem, ten miles south-east of Calais, after a journey of about four hours.

15. Enormous destruction of crops throughout the central provinces of Spain occasioned by the flights of locusts, which passed like a heavy cloud from district to district. In some cases the railway trains had to be stopped whilst the line was cleared.

16. Discovery of a revolutionary conspiracy at Warsaw, and the arrest of thirty-two persons announced.

— The sculling match between Wm. Beach, of Sydney, and E. Hanlan, of Toronto, for the championship of the world took place on the Paramatta River (Sydney, N.S.W.) Won by the Australian by a length and a half. Hanlan led for a considerable time, but was ultimately rowed down by Beach after a slight foul in which Hanlan was in the wrong.

— The Archbishop of Canterbury conferred the degree of D.D. upon the Rev. Inad-ud-Din, chaplain to the Bishop of Lahore, an eloquent preacher, and the commentator of various books of the New Testament. He was originally a doctor of theology in the Moslem world, and distinguished himself as a controversialist. In 1865 he commenced studying the evidences of Christianity, and in the following year was baptized, and in 1870 was ordained deacon by Bishop Milman, of Calcutta, who appointed him his examining chaplain.

18. The *Railway World* published the account of Major W. H. Kent's project for a railway connecting the American lines with those of Russia. Starting from Fort Simpson, the proposed western terminus of the Canadian Pacific line, the new railway would follow the coast-line of the Alaska territory to Mount Elias, a distance of 525 miles; thence across the Aleut and Yukar districts, 1,000 miles to the shores of Behring's Straits. At the narrowest part, round the Diomedé group of islands, the sea is comparatively free from ice all the year round, so that trains could either be transferred by ferry or by a series of tunnels, as the widest space between any two of the islands to the two continents is only one mile and a half. From Cape East, on the Asiatic side, this line would again follow the coast southwards to Vladivostok on the Russian frontier near the mouth of the Amur, passing through a mild temperature, and at this place would form a junction with the Russian lines, which already reach to Irkutsk, the capital of Siberia, and are to be pushed further eastwards by the Russian Government.

20. King Tawhiao and the three New Zealand chiefs who had come to England to put the case of the natives before the Colonial Office, left on their return after a stay of nearly three months.

— The election for the counties of Ross and Cromarty, consequent upon the resignation of Sir A. Matheson (Liberal), resulted in the return of Mr. R. C. Munro-Ferguson, of Novar (Liberal), by 717 votes, against Mr. A. R. Mackenzie, of Kintail (Conservative) 334, and Dr. R. Macdonald (Land Reformer and Crofters' candidate) 248 votes.

— The Prince and Princess of Wales visited Newcastle-on-Tyne, where they opened an addition to the public park, a natural history museum, and a free library. In the evening the town was illuminated and great enthusiasm prevailed.

21. Thomas Henry Orrock, aged 21, a prisoner undergoing sentence for burglary, brought up under writ of *habeas corpus* before the magistrate

at Bow Street on the charge of wilful murder of George Cole, a police constable, who was shot at Dalston on December 1, 1882, in the discharge of his duties.

21. The Prince and Princess of Wales, accompanied by their sons, embarked at Newcastle, leading a procession of steamers down the Tyne to a new dock, which the Prince formally opened.

— The old market of Athens, situated in the centre of the city, completely burned down.

— A general rising of the natives on the Zambesi reported from Mozambique. The Portuguese force sent against them were totally defeated, all being killed or wounded.

22. The Prince and Princess of Wales arrived at Edinburgh, and having formally visited the Forestry Exhibition, left for Dalmeny Park, the seat of the Earl of Rosebery.

— The Hygienic Congress, assembled at the Hague, passed resolutions in favour of an international sanitary code and of the creation of a permanent international scientific committee to act and advise in time of epidemics.

23. Foochow bombarded by the French fleet under Admiral Courbet, and after a slight resistance the Chinese guns were silenced and the arsenal partially destroyed.

— A great Conservative demonstration held at Nostall Priory, near Wakefield, the seat of Mr. Rowland Winn. Upwards of 100,000 persons were estimated to have been present, and speeches were made by Sir Stafford Northcote, Lord Cairns, Lord Carnarvon, and others.

— A serious increase of the cholera reported from Southern Europe, Spezia and some of the districts of Piedmont being especially attacked, whilst a few cases were reported from places as far east as Milan and Novara.

— The artillery barracks at Nusseerabad struck by lightning. The flash striking the upper story first, passed through the wall, injuring two men. It then crossed to the other side of the building, leaving no trace of its path, but killing six men in its course out through the open door. The buildings sustained scarcely any damage; and although the men last struck were sitting in a line, the centre man escaped unhurt.

25. According to a report of a committee appointed by the Chamber of Deputies to inquire into the condition of the working classes in France, it appeared that out of 300,000 working-men employed in Paris, less than one-tenth belong to syndicates or trades unions. Of 12,000 stone-masons only 600 were so affiliated; of 18,000 house-painters, 200; of 3,000 gilders, 150; of 11,000 bakers, 450; and of 20,000 *graveurs*, only 200.

— According to the annual report of the Chief Commissioner of Police, 21,110 new houses had been built in London during 1883, forming 361 new streets and one new square, and covering a distance of 56 miles 84 yards. The police force available for the protection of the public consisted of 21 superintendents, 561 inspectors, 874 sergeants, and 9,837 constables.

26. The shock of an earthquake, lasting about thirty seconds, felt in the Island of Jersey. Several persons were awakened by the violent shaking but beyond some damage to crockeryware no ill results were reported.

27. Mr. Gladstone left Hawarden for Midlothian. At Warrington, Wigan, and Preston, where the train stopped, large crowds awaited his passage, and greeted him with much enthusiasm. He was received at Edinburgh by Lord Rosebery and the representatives of the Liberal associations of the county.

28. The Prince and Princess of Wales visited Aberdeen for the purpose of presenting new colours to the 3rd battalion of the Gordon Highlanders.

— The Mingvy and Kinpai forts, which were constructed to defend the approaches to Foochow, attacked in the rear and destroyed by the French gunboats and one man-of-war under the command of Admiral Courbet.

29. Mr. H. J. Webb, an amateur tricyclist, accomplished a journey from the Land's End, *via* Exeter, Gloucester, Preston, Carlisle, Edinburgh, and Inverness, to John o' Groat's (a distance of 898 miles), in 7 days 18 hours 50 minutes.

— A serious cyclone burst over a portion of the State of Indiana. Trees were uprooted, steeples blown down, buildings wrecked, and several lives lost.

30. The Earl of Northbrook and Lord Wolseley left London for Egypt; the former as British High Commissioner, and the latter to superintend the military operations for the relief of Khartoum.

— Mr. Gladstone delivered the first of his addresses to the electors of Midlothian at the Edinburgh Corn Exchange.

— Great Conservative gathering at Hatfield, Lord Salisbury's seat in Herts, to support the action of the House of Lords. The principal speech was made by the Earl of Lytton.

31. At Warsaw, during the night, an attempt, which nearly proved successful, was made by the Russian Nihilists to liberate Judge Bardovsky and other political prisoners awaiting their trial. The Nihilists managed to enter the prison precincts through the citadel, and were only discovered as they were about to open the cells.

SEPTEMBER.

1. The foundation-stone of a new hall for the Butchers' Company laid in Bartholomew Close, to replace the old hall in Eastcheap, which had been pulled down in the carrying out of the Inner Circle railway and the consequent widening of Eastcheap. The original hall of the Company, built in 1548, had stood in almost the same spot as that chosen for the new buildings.

— The shock of an earthquake felt in Lower Austria extending from Voelau and Baden to Wiener Neustadt, where the congregation in a church, panic-stricken, rushed out of the building.

— The average price of wheat in the London market was 35s. 1d. per qr., the lowest price quoted since the introduction of corn returns.

2. Mr. Gladstone's speeches to his constituents concluded with an address to working-men in the Waverley Market, Edinburgh.

— The body of an Indian rajah, related to the Guikwar of Baroda, who

had died at Etretat (Normandy), was cremated on the seashore in the presence of his family and suite, his doctors, and the mayor of the town.

3. The Vienna police completed a series of arrests in the suburb of Neu-leucherfeld, which placed in their hands the ringleaders of the Anarchists in Austria. A secret printing office was also discovered, and a number of revolutionary documents addressed to the working classes.

5. At Temesvar, in Hungary, a great fire broke out, by which the whole of the Ungar Strasse, comprising several large buildings, was burned to the ground.

— A fire occurred at the General Post Office, St.-Martin's-le-Grand, originating with some empty sacks. An alarm was immediately given, and the fire arrested before any great damage was done.

6. A demonstration in favour of the Franchise Bill held at Glasgow, attended by upwards of 50,000 persons. The principal speech was made by Mr. G. Trevelyan. Resolutions were passed by acclamation in favour of restricting the powers of the House of Lords.

7. The British gunboat *Zephyr*, whilst cruising off Foochow, fired upon from the Kinpai forts, and her commander, Lieut. C. K. Hope, and four seamen wounded. She was mistaken for a French vessel. The Chinese officials and Government at once apologised.

— The Clerical party held a great gathering of their adherents in Brussels, which was even more numerous attended than that of the Liberals. The processions were repeatedly attacked by the mob, and serious rioting ensued.

8. At the Falmouth police court the captain, mate, and an able-bodied seaman, the survivors of the crew of the yacht *Mignonette*, charged with the murder of Richard Parker on the high seas. They left Southampton on May 19 in the yacht *Mignonette*, 33 tons, for Sydney. On July 5 the weather was most tempestuous, and a tremendous sea knocked in one of the sides of the yacht, which sank soon after. A punt 13 ft. long was launched, and the captain had just time to secure two tins of what he supposed was preserved meat and get into the punt before the yacht went down. Their situation then was this: There were four of them in a boat thirteen feet long, with no water, and only two 1-lb. tins of preserved turnips. For five days they lived on one of the tins of turnips. They then succeeded in capturing a turtle which was floating on the water. After the turtle and the remaining tin of turnips had been eaten, they passed nine days without any food whatever, and no water. The lad Parker drank sea-water. At the end of nineteen days the captain suggested that they should cast lots as to who should be killed for food for the rest. Brooks considered that they should rather die together. By this time Parker was in the last stage of exhaustion. The captain and the mate discussed the killing of Parker, who was evidently the nearest to death of the four. Brooks declined to be a party to such an act. The captain and the mate nevertheless decided to kill Parker. Before doing so, Dudley prayed that they might be forgiven for what they were about to do. Parker was lying in the bottom of the boat in an almost insensible state, with his face on his arm. It was then arranged that Dudley should stab him, and that Stephens should hold him if he struggled. Brooks went to the bow of the boat and turned away his head.

The captain then said to Parker, "Now, Dick, your hour has come." Parker replied feebly, "What, me, sir? oh, don't!" Dudley then ran a pen-knife into Parker's jugular vein, and he died in a few seconds. They caught the flowing blood in the tins and divided it between them, Brooks being unable to resist taking his share. They then stripped the boy, and for five days subsisted on his body before they were sighted by the *Montezuma*. When that vessel came alongside they were too exhausted to get on board and had to be lifted out of their boat. During the twenty-four days they were in the punt they had drifted 1,050 miles without seeing a sail.

8. A great fire occurred at Cleveland, Ohio, by which a large portion of the manufacturing quarter of the town was destroyed, to the value of two million dollars.

— The Czar, accompanied by the Czarina and his family, arrived at Warsaw, where upwards of 1,000 persons were said to have been previously arrested and confined in prison.

9. The cholera, of which for some time isolated cases had occurred at Naples, suddenly increased so rapidly that the sick were abandoned in the streets, and the dead could not be removed. Eleven hundred deaths were reported to have occurred since the outbreak; the maximum number ranging from 250 to 300 in twenty-four hours.

10. The appointment of Lord Dufferin to be Viceroy of India, in succession to the Marquess of Ripon, notified.

— Serious cyclones caused great damage in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa.

— At Doncaster the St. Leger Stakes won by Mr. R. C. Vyner's "The Lambkin," 9 st. Thirteen started.

11. The Dominion Line steamer *Vancouver* passed Heath Point, Anticosti, six days and five hours after leaving Liverpool, the fastest passage to Canada on record.

— A cyclone passed over the island of Iceland, causing great destruction to property and shipping. Nineteen vessels, chiefly Norwegian traders, were lost, and sixty small fishing-boats were wrecked, involving the loss of many lives.

12. The Trades Union Congress, assembled at Aberdeen, concluded its sittings, having passed resolutions that the action of the House of Lords in delaying the Franchise Bill was to be regretted; that the House of Lords ought to be abolished; and that hereditary principles should be expunged from the Constitution.

13. Sir Edward Malet, K.C.B., Minister at Brussels, appointed to succeed Lord Ampthill as Ambassador at Berlin.

— The Australian cricketers completed their fourth tour in England, having played thirty-two matches, in which they were defeated seven times. In 1882 they played thirty-eight matches with only four defeats. Murdoch, as previously, headed the score in batting, and Spofforth was the most effective bowler.

14. A funeral procession, comprised of about 12,000 artisans and others, marched through the principal streets of Dublin to pay a tribute of respect to Denis Duggan, a prominent Fenian leader. He was interred in Glasnevin Cemetery.

15. The Emperors of Germany and Austria arrived at Skierniewice, a small town in Russian Poland, where they were received by the Czar and the Russian Imperial Family. The Emperors were accompanied by their chancellors and other high officials. The most elaborate preparations were taken against outrages by Nihilists or Anarchists; no civilians being permitted to approach the village or the railways by which the monarchs travelled except by special permission.

— The centenary of the first balloon ascent in London (by Signor Lunardi, Secretary to the Neapolitan Embassy) celebrated by a dinner at the ground of the Honourable Artillery Company, Finsbury. Three balloons ascended, and an address was delivered by M. de Fonvielle, president of the French Aëronautical Society.

— A serious fire broke at the Surrey County Lunatic Asylum (Wandsworth), which, although confined to the farm buildings, was not extinguished until much damage was done and considerable alarm occasioned.

16. At the Central Criminal Court, James Wright and William Wheatley were respectively sentenced to penal servitude for life and twenty years for having shot three police constables at Hoxton on July 17, who were threatening to arrest them for burglary.

— Sir Stafford Northcote delivered at the Corn Exchange, Edinburgh, the first of a series of addresses on the political situation. At Edinburgh, as well as at the various places in Scotland where his passing was known, the Conservative leader received a hearty and general welcome.

— A fire broke out in the Roman Catholic Cathedral, St. George's, Moorfields, but was extinguished before any serious damage was done.

17. The burgomasters of the principal Belgian towns waited upon the King to request him to withhold his sanction to the new Education Bill. On his Majesty's refusal to act in opposition to the Constitution, disturbances took place in Brussels, and cries of "*Vive la République!*" were raised by the crowd.

— The twenty-eighth meeting of the Social Science Congress opened at Birmingham. Mr. J. Geo. Shaw-Lefevre, M.P., delivered the inaugural address.

18. A renewal of outrages reported from various parts of Ireland; cattle were maimed, ricks burnt, farmhouses fired, and obnoxious farmers assaulted and shot at.

19. A slight earthquake shock, varying in intensity but doing no damage, felt along the whole line of the western slope of the Alleghany Mountains to the Mississippi river.

— A serious outbreak of typhoid fever, by which upwards of seventy persons were affected, reported from Kidderminster. Careful sanitary inspection showed that the water supply of the town had been contaminated by the sewage, which passed in defective pipes in close proximity to the reservoir.

20. The Arlberg Railway, connecting the Swiss railway system with the Tyrolean and Austrian lines, formally opened by the Emperor of Austria.

— Thomas Henry Orrock convicted of the murder of Police-Constable Cole at Dalston in December, 1882, and sentenced to death.

20. Mr. Dale, an aéronaut, accompanied by his wife and a gentleman, attempted to cross the Firth of Forth. Ascending from the Forestry Exhibition at Edinburgh, their course was at first fair; but, the balloon suddenly rising, they were carried out to sea. After some difficulty they descended about three miles off May Island. A steamer perceived the balloon and made for it; but it was driven faster than the steamer. At length the car struck the water, and became partially submerged, and with some difficulty the balloonists were rescued by a boat from the steamer.

22. About 3 A.M. H.M. gunboat *Wasp*, 465 tons, was wrecked on the north side of Tory Island, off the coast of Donegal, and out of a crew of fifty-eight officers and men only six of the latter escaped with their lives—although the wreck occurred within fifty yards of the lighthouse and the weather was clear and fair.

— In the Art Section of the Social Science Congress, Mr. J. G. Shaw-Lefevre presiding, Mrs. Kendal the actress (Miss Madge Robertson) read a paper on the "Drama."

— Sir Stafford Northcote concluded his Northern campaign by two speeches delivered at Newcastle-on-Tyne, where he addressed very large audiences.

26. Serious outbreak of cholera reported from Genoa, where, up to this time, the cases had been few in number and mild in character.

27. An attempt made to blow up the Council House at Salisbury, presented to the city in 1798 by the Earl of Radnor. At about 11 P.M. a tremendous explosion was heard. When the smoke had cleared away it was found that a canister containing some explosive mixture had been placed on a gun-platform beneath the east window of the Council House, of which the glass and tracery was completely wrecked, and considerable damage of a like character had been done to the surrounding buildings.

29. Lord Wolseley and his staff left Cairo for the front, with the object of pushing forward to Khartoum without awaiting the arrival of reinforcements.

30. The twenty-fourth Annual Church Congress opened at Carlisle, the inaugural address being given by the Bishop of the Diocese.

— The Marquess of Salisbury received with great enthusiasm at Glasgow, where he had arrived as the guest of Sir Archibald Campbell of Blythwood, in order to attend a great Conservative demonstration.

OCTOBER.

1. The bicentenary anniversary of the death of Pierre Corneille, celebrated by religious services at the church of St. Roch, where the poet was buried, and attended by the leading members of the literary and dramatic world. An address was given by the Abbé Millault. In the evening there was a gala performance of *Polyeucte*, &c. at the Comédie Française.

2. A prize-fight took place at Banstead between Maine and Middings in the presence of a number of persons, and lasted more than an hour before the police interfered, when the principals and some of the spectators were taken into custody.

2. The new Council Chamber erected at Guildhall, after designs by the City Architect (Mr. Horace Jones), opened with great ceremony.

3. A fire, supposed to have been smouldering for many days, broke out in the Royal Castle of Christiansborg at Copenhagen, due to the over-heating of old flues. The Rittersaal and Chambers occupied by the Rigsdag were completely destroyed; the paintings and curiosities were for the most part saved, but the Thorvaldsen Museum, which forms part of the palace, only escaped by the blowing up by dynamite of the intervening buildings.

— Crowded meetings addressed by the Marquess of Salisbury at Glasgow, and Lord Randolph Churchill at Leeds, in support of the Conservative policy.

4. The total eclipse of the (harvest) moon, visible throughout Great Britain, seen under remarkably favourable circumstances.

— Colonel J. Donald Stewart (11th Hussars), M. Herbin, French Vice-Consul at Khartoum, and a party of forty men, treacherously massacred by the Arabs at Wady Garna, where the steamer, on its passage from Berber to Dongola, struck upon a rock.

6. The Court-martial on the survivors of the *Wasp* gunboat, wrecked off Tory Island, found that her loss was in consequence of want of due care and attention in the navigation.

— Both the Western Union Cables, known as the Gould Cables, and the recently laid Mackay-Barnett cable, found to be unworkable, and presumed to have been broken by icebergs in shallow water off Newfoundland.

— The Inner Circle of the Metropolitan Railway completed and opened for traffic. By its means also the Outer Circle brought the South-Eastern and other lines south of the Thames into connection with the Metropolitan system.

— T. H. Orrock and T. Harris hanged in Newgate; the former for shooting Police-Constable Cole, and the latter for the murder of his wife.

7. A terrific cyclone, of which Catania was the centre, burst upon the eastern coast of the island of Sicily. Thirty bodies were found among the ruins of the devastated villages, 350 were seriously injured, and the damage done to property was estimated at five millions of lire. Four days later the cyclone again broke over the same district.

— The National Liberal Federation met at Leeds, under the presidency of Mr. J. Kitson, and decided to raise a fund of 100,000*l.*, to "promote the success of the Franchise Bill; to settle the question of Redistribution, and to maintain the authority of the House of Commons."

— At Newmarket the Cesarewitch Stakes, won in a canter by four lengths by Mr. J. Hammond's St. Gatien, 3 yrs., 8 st. 10 lbs. Twenty started.

— The entire racing stud of the Dowager Duchess of Montrose ("Mr. Manton") offered at public auction, and twenty-four out of the forty lots changed hands, realising 11,195 guineas.

8. H.M.S. *Rodney* (9,470 tons) launched at Chatham.

— French troops, about six hundred strong, having landed at Tamsui, fell into an ambush, and whilst retreating were attacked in great force by the Chinese General Tso, who inflicted on them a severe defeat.

8. A conference of the Conservative leaders, the Marquess of Salisbury and Earl Cairns, took place at Gordon Castle, the Duke of Richmond's Scottish residence.

— At Newmarket, the Middle Park Plate for 2-yr.-olds won by Lord Hastings' "Melton."

9. The *Standard* published a draft of the Government Redistribution Bill, the accuracy of which was at once officially denied, although it was also asserted to have been obtained "through breach of duty."

— Bank of England raised its rate of discount from two to three per cent. The reserve amounted to 10,473,000*l.*, being 43½ per cent. of the liabilities.

10. A duel took place near Paris between M. Rochefort and Captain Fournier, arising out of an offensive article on the Tientsin Treaty which had appeared in *L'Intransigeant*. Both combatants were slightly wounded.

— Dr. Samuel Rabbeth, aged 27, senior resident medical officer at the Royal Free Hospital, Gray's Inn Road, finding that a child on whom tracheotomy had been performed would die of diphtheria, unless the suffocating membrane were removed, sucked it away through a tube, fully conscious of his danger. He was almost at once infected, and died in consequence of his self-devotion.

11. The Parliament buildings in course of erection at Quebec were the scene of two violent explosions, the noise and shock of which extended through the city. The front façade of the structure was greatly damaged; houses in the immediate neighbourhood suffered severely, but no loss of life occurred. There was an interval of nearly three hours between the two explosions, the second taking place at the opposite side of the building. Opinions were at first divided as to the cause of the outrage—Fenianism, or a trade dispute between the Irish and French workmen employed.

— Proclamation issued announcing the British Protectorate over all the southern coasts of New Guinea, to the eastward of the 141st meridian of east longitude.

— After a week's trial, conducted with the greatest secrecy in the St. Petersburg Palace of Justice, fourteen Nihilists, including six military and naval officers, Mary Fiquer, *alias* Vera Filipava, a priest's daughter aged 30, Lindenella Wolkeinstein, 'gentlewoman,' aged 25, and another 'gentlewoman,' aged 28, tried on various political charges. The officers and the two ladies named were condemned to death, but only two of the officers were executed, the remaining prisoners being sentenced to hard labour in Siberia.

— Great Liberal demonstration at Chatsworth Park, speeches made by Lord Hartington, Sir W. Harcourt, and others. At Kelso Lord Salisbury addressed a large gathering of Conservatives, and Sir R. Cross and Mr. Gibson another gathering at Wigan; whilst at Bradford Mr. Forster presided at a large and enthusiastic assembly of Liberals.

13. The first of a series of meetings organised by the Conservative Association held at Birmingham. The proceedings commenced with public reception of Sir S. Northcote and Lord R. Churchill at the railway station (at both of which great enthusiasm was displayed), to be followed by a meeting in Aston Grounds. Admission was by ticket, but the local Liberals, having organised a counter-demonstration outside the Aston Grounds, ultimately

scaled the walls in great numbers, and without interference from the police wrecked the hall in which the meeting was to be held, destroyed everything portable in the gardens, and ultimately broke up the meeting when Sir S. Northcote attempted to speak.

13. The Prime Meridian Conference assembled at Washington, after strong objections on the part of the French delegate, adopted Greenwich as the universal time. The only vote against the proposal was that of the representative of San Domingo; the delegates of France and Brazil abstained.

14. Great distress reported from Tyneside, on account of the closing of shipbuilding yards, and the large number of ships (steamers) laid up for want of freight. Public funds for the sufferers opened at Newcastle, Sunderland, Hartlepool, &c.

— The Supreme Tribunal of Darmstadt confirmed the petition of the Grand Duke of Darmstadt for dissolving his marriage with hismorganatic wife Countess Alexandrina von Hutten-Czapska (Madame de Kolomine). The marriage certificate, dated July 9, 1884, was admitted to be valid; the plea of divorce was supported by the hostile attitude of the petitioner's family and nearest relations; the excitement and condemnatory sentiments of his own subjects; his own conviction of the impossibility of continuing the union, which he had himself dissolved two days after its conclusion; the further conviction of the respondent that under the circumstances the union could not produce happiness, and the consequent mutual consent of both parties to the divorce.

15. The ocean race between the Cunard ship *Oregon* and the National Line *America*, from New York to Queenstown, won by the former by about six hours in 6 days, 12 hours, and 27 minutes. The *America* made a slightly longer course by about eight miles, and was detained two hours and a half by heated bearings.

— The Liverpool police, on the arrival of the steamship *Lord Clive* from Philadelphia, arrested a passenger who gave the name of Howaneer, in whose possession was found a number of dynamite charges ready for use. The suspected man proved to be a Hungarian, and after a short remand his explanation of the possession of dynamite was found to be correct, and he was released.

16. An explosion of gas, resulting in the death of one person, and serious injury to more than a dozen others, took place in Bermondsey, near London Bridge; the premises destroyed, consisting of a block of four-roomed tenements, were situated in the centre of the tanning district, and in the midst of a dense population. An escape of gas rendered it necessary for the inhabitants to complain to the Gas Company, who sent two of their workmen to examine the ground. Having failed to discover the leakage, one of the men with a lighted rope went into the house, and an explosion immediately ensued with terrible results.

— Inspector Robson of the Thames police lost his life whilst patrolling the river in a small boat without any companion. It was supposed that the boat was run down by a tug, and the night being dark no assistance was at hand to save the Inspector's life.

20. The "Tichborne Claimant," who had been convicted as Arthur Orton, *alias* Thomas Castro, released from Pentonville prison after undergoing ten

years and eight months sentence of penal servitude, the remainder of the term of fourteen years having been remitted on the ground of the prisoner's good conduct. Weighing twenty-six stone at the time of his conviction, he had been reduced to about eighteen stone on his liberation.

20. Speeches made at public meetings by the Chancellor of the Exchequer at Pontefract, Mr. Chamberlain at Denbigh, and Sir Charles Dilke at Kensington.

21. At Newmarket the Cambridgeshire Stakes won by Mr. J. Hammond's Florence, 4 yrs., 9 st. 1 lb. (F. Webb), the heaviest weight with which this race had ever been won; eighteen started.

— The larger part of the town of Carthage in New York State burnt down; 160 buildings, several churches and mills, to the value of a million dollars, destroyed.

— The Marquess of Salisbury brought his campaign in Scotland to a close by addressing a large meeting at Dumfries. An attempt at rioting marked the close of the proceedings. Lord Salisbury's carriage, in which were his two daughters, being mobbed by the crowd, and for a time the party were in some danger. Windows were freely broken in the town, but after a short time calm was restored without serious accident.

22. Mr. G. O. Trevelyan's succession to the Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster, and promotion to the Cabinet in the room of Mr. J. G. Dodson, announced.

23. Parliament opened by Royal Commission for an autumn session.

— A sudden outbreak of cholera reported from Yport, a village on the coast of Normandy between Fécamp and Etretat, and about thirteen miles from Le Havre. In twenty days there were eleven cases and six deaths. According to an account given by a Rouen newspaper, the disease appears to have been brought to Yport by three of the crew of a Newfoundland fishing-vessel, the *Louise-Marie*, which in the usual course of trade had called at Cette, in the Mediterranean. The first case was that of a sister-in-law of one of the crew; she had washed his clothes on the beach. The same night she fell ill, and four days afterwards she was dead. Her death was followed by that of the seaman's brother. Next a girl of ten, living opposite, was attacked, and died. A sister of the washerwoman shortly followed, and two days later her father was found dead in his bed.

24. The diplomatic difficulty between Portugal and the Vatican in consequence of the protest raised by the latter against the appointment of Monsignor Agliardi as Apostolic delegate at Bombay arranged; the Holy See recognising the Portuguese contention in favour of the supreme Roman Catholic jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Goa.

— The Law Courts reopened with the customary ceremonial. The "Long Vacation," which from time immemorial had closed on November 2, had been shortened by ten days by an order in Council based on the recommendation of the Council of Judges. Previous to the meeting of the judges at the Royal Courts of Justice, Mr. Alderman Nottage, the Lord Mayor elect, presented to the Lord Chancellor at his private residence.

26. The London Trades Council summoned a meeting in Hyde Park to support the action of the Government in the matter of the Franchise. At

nine platforms, arranged in a semi-circle, identical resolutions were passed in favour of the Bill and condemnatory of the House of Lords. It was estimated that upwards of 80,000 persons were present in the Park.

27. A numerously attended meeting held at the Mansion House, under the presidency of Mr. Hyde Clarke (in the absence of the Lord Mayor), to promote the establishment of a British Commercial Geographical Society.

29. At a meeting of the Glasgow University Council, Lords Stair, Bute, Lorne, Reay, and Balfour were nominated for the Chancellorship of the University in the place of the Duke of Buccleuch. Lord Stair received 187 votes, Lord Bute 134, Lord Reay 25, Lord Balfour 2, and Lord Lorne 0. A poll was demanded. Lord Rosebery, previous to the nomination, withdrew his candidature.

30. Announcement made that the Queen had conferred baronies of the United Kingdom upon the Earl of Arran, Viscount de Vesci (Irish peers), Lord Herries (a Scotch peer), Rt. Hon. J. G. Dodson, M.P. for Scarborough (Baron Monk Bretton), and Sir Walter James, Bart. (Baron Northbourne).

— The Bank of England raised its rate of discount from 3 to 4 per cent. ; the Reserve, although standing at 35½ per cent. of the liabilities, having fallen to 10,062,000*l*.

— The International Health Exhibition at South Kensington closed, having been visited since its opening (151 days) by 4,167,683 persons.

31. Serious disturbances arose between the police and Arabs at Hyderabad, in the course of which eleven of the former were killed. The Arabs looted the police stations, and caused a panic in the city. The Nizam at once summoned the troops from Golconda, and order was speedily restored.

— According to the *Nonconformist*, the financial position of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners showed the value of Episcopal estates to be 14,185,558*l*. ; that of the Capitular estates 5,920,325*l*. The amount invested in Government and other securities was 5,643,678*l*. ; and the rents, ground rents and rack rents from property in or near London amounted to 223,290*l*. per ann. The commissioners were landowners in almost every county, holding nearly 150,000 acres, with a gross estimated rental of 311,207*l*.

NOVEMBER.

1. A panic arising out of a false alarm of fire occurred at the Star Theatre, Glasgow. In the rush made towards the doors fifteen persons were killed, chiefly young persons, and many were injured.

— The elections to fill the vacancies in the English borough corporations took place ; the result being a slight gain for the Liberals. In the principal boroughs the Liberals carried seventy seats, the Conservatives fifty-eight ; at Macclesfield two trades-unionists and at Burslem a working-man were elected.

3. Notices of ejection having been threatened against a number of crofters in the Isle of Skye, two bands, each 300 strong, were posted in the Uig district to resist the advance of the police or Sheriff's officers.

— The contest at Scarborough, vacant by the elevation of Mr. Dodson to

the peerage, resulted in the election of Col. Steble (Liberal) over Sir Geo. Sitwell (Conservative) by 1,895 to 1,606 votes.

4. Mr. Gladstone laid the foundation stone of the National Liberal Club to be erected in Northumberland Avenue, from designs by Mr. Waterhouse, at an estimated cost of 120,000*l*.

5. A disastrous boiler explosion occurred at the Staffordshire Steelworks, Bilston, whereby four men were killed and twenty injured. Late in the evening, three out of a range of ten large boilers, which generated steam for thirty-three engines, burst one after another, shattering the large engine house and basic shed.

— The appearance of several cases of Asiatic cholera in Paris announced, of which five terminated fatally. At a subsequent meeting of the Council-Général of the Seine, the Préfet, M. Camescasse, stated that cholera had appeared in the department in the previous July, when about one hundred deaths occurred.

6. The Bank of England further raised its rate of discount from 4 to 5 per cent. The reserve showed a further reduction caused by an increase of 10,720*l*. in the circulation of notes, and a decrease of 534,052*l*. in coin and bullion, whilst the proportion to the liabilities was 34 per cent.

— At the Birmingham Police Court summonses for a libel were applied for against the men whose depositions had been read by Mr. Chamberlain in the House of Commons.

— At the Exeter Assizes, before Baron Huddleston, Thos. Dudley and Edward Stephens were indicted for the murder on the high seas of a boy—one of the survivors of the crew of the *Mignonette*. The argument for the defence was that the men were justified by the inevitable necessity of the case. By direction of the judge the jury found the facts proved; but left to the Court of Criminal Appeal to decide what in law the prisoners' offence might be. The jury at the same time strongly recommended them to the commiseration of the Crown, and the judge ordered their liberation on bail.

7. The result of the Presidential election in the United States, after much delay, declared to have been in favour of Mr. Cleveland, the Democratic candidate.

— Vice-Chancellor Bacon granted an injunction restraining the executrix of Rosina Lady Lytton from publishing the letters of the late Lord Lytton in the book which Miss Devey had announced for publication.

8. The seat for South Warwickshire, vacant by the death of Hon. Gilbert Leigh, carried by Mr. Sampson Lloyd (Conservative), by 3,095 votes, against Lord Wm. Compton (Liberal), who polled 1,919.

— Negro disturbances consequent upon the result of the Presidential election reported from various parts of the Southern States. Napoleonville (Louisiana) and Palatka (Florida) set on fire, the negroes refusing to assist in extinguishing the flames.

— An explosion from firedamp at the Hochin Colliery, near Tredegar, caused the death of fifteen persons, besides doing an enormous amount of damage. At Wasmes, near Mons, in Belgium, another colliery took fire, occasioning the loss of twenty lives, and injury to many others.

10. Lord Mayor's "Show" included numerous novel features. In addi-

tion to the usual civic accompaniments of the pageant, a group, consisting of a Nile boat fully equipped for war, camels with Soudanese attendants, represented Egypt; India was symbolised by a number of elephants with their mahouts. Then followed the kings and queens of England (in historic costume) who had conferred favours and rights upon the City Corporation, from William the Conqueror to Queen Elizabeth—in each case attended by the most prominent warriors or statesmen of their times. There were also tableaux representing Wat Tyler and Lord Mayor Walworth, Dick Whittington, &c.

10. The large oil mills of Messrs. Stewart & Spencer, at Strood, near Rochester, almost wholly destroyed by fire.

11. The agitation of the Skye crofters against the ejectment notices served upon some of their number increased in intensity. A large crowd assembled at Portree, armed with heavy cudgels, to resist the police. After consultation among the leaders, the horns were sounded, and some five or six hundred adjourned to the summit of Craig Dhu. Complaints were made that rents were raised threefold, tenants deprived of their hill-grazing, and that the tacksmen alone reaped any profit from sheep-rearing.

12. Madame Adelina Patti's divorce from the Marquis de Caux pronounced by the Civil Tribunal of Paris. Cross-petitions had been presented by husband and wife, but the Court only took cognisance of that of the marquis.

— A serious fray between poachers and constables took place on Lord Wharncliffe's estate, Walley Park. Sergeant Smith, four constables, and several keepers came in contact with fifteen poachers. A furious fight ensued; stones were thrown, and sticks freely used. After serious injuries being inflicted on the police, five of the poachers were arrested.

13. A billiard match, 10,000 points up, played between J. Roberts, jun. (champion of the world), and I. G. Sala (champion of Scotland), the latter receiving 3,000 start. Although the spot stroke was barred, scoring proceeded very rapidly. No fewer than twenty-six breaks of over 100 and one of 266 were made by Roberts, who overtook his opponent at 6,144, and won the match by 1,625 points.

— H. M. corvette *Active*, which had recently been refitted and her old muzzle-loading guns replaced by breechloaders of the newest type, had her armament tested. At the second discharge of one gun firing a shot, the whole of the chain protruding from the port was blown away. Nobody was, however, injured.

14. The Afghan Frontier Commission, under Colonel Ridgeway, having marched 100 miles in four days, arrived in the neighbourhood of Herat, and were cordially welcomed by the Governor and population.

— At Clitheroe (Lancashire), about five P.M., the sharp shock of an earthquake was distinctly felt, occasioning much alarm, but doing but little damage.

— At Hanau, in Germany, two trains came into collision, occasioning the loss of twelve lives and seriously injuring twenty other persons.

— A destructive fire broke out at Messrs. Shepherd's timber yard, Hammersmith, raging for many hours, and defying the efforts of the firemen until it had consumed an enormous quantity of timber and other property.

14. A special service held in St. Paul's Cathedral to commemorate the hundredth anniversary of the consecration of Bishop Seabury, the first Bishop of the American Church (1784-9). Bishop Seabury was consecrated at Aberdeen by Dr. Robert Kilgoban Prince and other Scotch bishops, and was successively Senior Bishop (1789-96) and first Bishop of Rhode Island from November 18, 1790. The commemoration service was attended by the Archbishop of Canterbury and twenty prelates, Anglican and American.

15. Professor Bain elected Lord Rector of Aberdeen University by three nations against Lord Randolph Churchill, who received the support of one nation. At the Glasgow University Professor Lushington elected Lord Rector without opposition.

— A terrible murder committed at Babbicombe Glen, near Torquay, the residence of an elderly lady, Miss Keyse, who had been lady-in-waiting to the Queen shortly after her accession. At an early hour in the morning the house was found to be in flames, which were with difficulty arrested, and on entering the dining-room the body of Miss Keyse was found, the clothing burnt off, much scarred, and with a gash in her throat and her skull fractured.

16. A considerable body of marines landed near Uig (Skye) without opposition from the crofters, the greater number of whom were attending divine service.

17. A force of 250 marines and marine artillery, accompanied by twenty constables, left Uig for Staffin, on the north-eastern corner of Skye, one of the most disaffected districts in the island. The party marched across a bleak country, scarcely meeting a human being. On reaching Staffin, H.M. Gunboat *Banterer* and the steamer *Lochiel* were lying off the shore; and it was hoped by this demonstration of force to overawe the populace.

— Right Hon. G. J. Shaw-Lefevre transferred from the Office of Works to be Postmaster-General in the place of Mr. Fawcett. Sir Thomas Brassey succeeded Mr. Campbell Bannerman as Secretary to the Admiralty, and Mr. Caine appointed Civil Lord of the Admiralty.

— Conference on Western Africa met at Berlin, and elected Prince Bismarck its President.

18. A largely attended meeting of the Conservative party held at the Carlton Club, to consult as to the proposals of the Government on the Franchise question.

— Mr. W. E. Forster presided at an influential meeting held at the Westminster Palace Hotel to support the foundation of "The Imperial Federation League," whose objects should be to secure the permanent unity of the empire, without interference with the existing rights of local parties as regarded local affairs; and to combine upon an equitable basis the resources of the empire for the maintenance of common interests, and adequately to provide for an organised defence of common rights. Lords Normanby, Rosebery, and Dunraven, Sir John Macdonald (Premier of Canada), Mr. Murray Smith (Agent-General of Victoria), and the representatives of several colonies spoke in support of the proposed league.

— A conference of representative farmers held in London, whereat the president (Mr. Bear) showed that for ninety-four years the prices of cereals (wheat, barley, and oats) had never been so low, and anticipated that wheat

would hardly again exceed an average of forty shillings a quarter. Incidentally he showed that since the Crimean War rents of farmland had risen twenty millions sterling per annum.

19. The vacancy for Hackney, occasioned by the death of Professor Fawcett, filled by the election of Professor Stuart (professor of applied mechanics at Cambridge University) by 14,540, against 8,543 votes given to Mr. M'Alister (Conservative).

— A fatal epidemic reported from the remote counties of North-West Virginia, adjoining Kentucky. Drought having exhausted the ordinary wells, the inhabitants drank the water from some mineral wells, which produced a peculiar disease as deadly as cholera. The mortality of the district was variously estimated at from 400 to 800; the disease was terribly sudden in its effects, the proportion of fatal cases being from sixty to eighty per cent. of those attacked.

20. Miss Finney, who had acted at the Savoy Theatre under the stage name of Fortescue, obtained (by consent) a verdict with damages 10,000*l.*, the largest amount on record, for a breach of promise of marriage against Lord Garmoye, eldest son of Earl Cairns.

— The Marquess of Bute having withdrawn, the Earl of Stair was elected Chancellor of the University of Glasgow without a contest.

— Wanstead Park Grotto, originally erected by the Countess of Mornington, and the last remaining monument of one of the finest family estates in the Eastern counties, destroyed by fire. Wanstead Manor had originally belonged to Westminster Abbey, and, after passing through various hands, was sold in 1882 by Lord Cowley to the Corporation of the City of London, by whom it was converted into a public park.

21. At the Middlesex Sessions Lord Marcus Beresford was tried for having on October 16 assaulted Mr. J. Gibson Bowles, the proprietor and editor of *Vanity Fair*, for reflections upon the defendant's conduct as trustee for Mrs. Trevelyan. After a lengthy trial and short defence the jury found a verdict of Not Guilty.

— The excessive coldness of the weather and heavy snow-storms drove herds of wolves from the Carpathian Mountains into the cultivated districts, spreading terror and doing serious injury. At Homonna a pack of 120 wolves entered the village while the inhabitants were at church, and were not driven out until a squadron of uhlans attacked them with swords and carbines.

— A cyclone burst over the town of Madras, doing considerable damage to the shipping; whilst, on land, it breached the northern embankment of the Red Hills Lake, the only reservoir of drinking water possessed by the town. Although 9 feet below the parapet running round the embankment, the water was forced over the edge, and the embankment torn away, whilst all the water escaped to the sea, carrying with it two small villages, some isolated houses, and six persons.

22. The case of Adams v. Coleridge for libel, contained in a letter addressed by the Hon. B. Coleridge to his sister, and reflecting on the plaintiff's character, concluded before Mr. Justice Manisty and a special jury, having lasted two days. Mr. Adams conducted his own case, and the Attorney-General and others appeared for Mr. Coleridge. After some consultation the jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff on the ground that the

defendant showed vindictiveness in not withdrawing the letter when the opportunity offered, and they awarded the plaintiff 3,000*l.* damages. Mr. Justice Manisty ruled that there was no evidence on which such a verdict could be founded, and gave judgment for the defendant with costs.

22. Lord Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote attended a meeting of the Committee of the Cabinet on Redistribution.

23. A serious encounter took place in Paris between the Socialists and the police, supported by the soldiery. About 2,000 workmen out of employ assembled at the Salle Lévis on the Boulevard des Batignolles, where they were addressed by inflammatory speeches. Rushing on to the Boulevard, they manifested an intention of sacking the bakers' shops, when the police intervened. After a protracted struggle, in which many were injured, the gendarmerie were called on to assist the police, and eventually the streets were cleared and order restored.

24. Kay Howarth and H. Hammond Swindells executed in Strangeways Gaol, Manchester, the former having been condemned for the murder of Richard Dugdale at Bolton, and the latter for that of James Wilde at Oldham.

— Two shocks of an earthquake were felt at Concord and in other parts of New Hampshire, the second being so severe as to shake the city buildings.

— At Burntisland, in the Frith of Forth, some men, in removing a straw rick, discovered the apparently dead body of a girl of eighteen years of age. Restoratives having been applied, she gradually recovered consciousness, and stated that she had left Perth with a few coppers in her pocket, intending to walk to Edinburgh. Having spent her last penny on food, she was unable to pay for the ferry, and crept into a rick, where she passed six days and nights without food.

25. A fire broke out in the reference department of the Newcastle Free Library, recently opened by the Prince of Wales. A considerable number of books were destroyed, and many more damaged by water. At Queenborough, near Sheerness, a fire also destroyed the chemical works, said to have been in existence there for over 200 years. The damage done was estimated at 10,000*l.*

— At a meeting of the People's League for the Abolition of the Hereditary Legislative Chamber, Sir Wilfrid Lawson presiding, a resolution was carried, despite the protests of the Chairman and several members of Parliament, calling for the abolition of the hereditary monarchy and the adoption of Republican principles by the League.

26. At Scarborough Mr. Caine, who had accepted office, was re-elected by 1,832 votes, his opponent, Sir Geo. Sitwell (Conservative), polling 1,639.

— At Greenock the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Mr. James Stewart was filled by the election of Mr. Thos. Sutherland (Liberal), Chairman of the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, who polled 3,548 votes, against 2,417 given to Mr. Scott (Conservative).

— Mr. Chamberlain, M.P., President of the Board of Trade, examined at the Birmingham Police Court as a witness in the charge of libel brought by Mr. R. C. Jarvis, a leading Conservative, against certain persons whose depositions had been read in the House of Commons by Mr. Chamberlain.

— An attempt made to blow up the Town Hall, Royton, near Oldham,

with dynamite, placed in a cellar underneath the offices occupied by the Local Government Board. A good deal of damage was done to furniture and fittings.

26. Prince Bismarck defeated by 180 to 99 votes in the newly-elected Reichstag on the question of the payment of members, a proposal against which the Government protested.

27. Madame Hugues, wife of M. Clovis Hugues, deputy for Marseilles, whilst walking in the hall of the Palais de Justice (Paris) with her husband and another deputy, suddenly drew a revolver and fired several shots at a private detective named Morin, who was passing. The reason alleged was that for a long time Morin had been engaged in traducing Madame Hugues' character.

— Captain R. W. Blackwood Ker (Conservative) returned for County Down by 4,387 votes, against Mr. Sharman Crawford (Liberal), who polled 3,998 votes.

— Several violent shocks of earthquake felt at Geneva shortly before midnight.

— Edinburn House (Castleisland), near Tralee, the residence of Mr. S. B. Hussey, made the object of an attack with dynamite. The windows throughout the house, as well as the east-end walls, were destroyed, but none of the family nor of the police residing on the premises were injured.

28. The marriage of the Comte di Avarni and the Princess Dolgorouki, widow of the late Czar, Alexander II., took place in Paris. Comte di Avarni had for some time been First Secretary of the Italian Embassy at Paris.

— Archbishop Trench formally handed in his resignation to the Synods of Dublin, Kildare, and Glendalough. Pending the election of a successor to the Archbishopric of Dublin, the management of the province devolved upon the Senior Bishop (Limerick).

— At Dundee, the Arctic Yard, belonging to Messrs. Stephens, caught fire. The warehouses, filled with sealskins, whalebone, and oil, burnt rapidly, and within half an hour the principal buildings were completely destroyed.

29. The great billiard match, 12,000 up, lasting six days, between Cook and Peall concluded at the Westminster Aquarium. When the game was last called—Peall, 11,386, Cook, 9,074—the former began what proved ultimately to be an unfinished break of 614, thus winning the match by 2,926 points.

— Professor Henry Roscoe received the honour of knighthood from the Queen at Windsor.

— The case of *Mrs. Weldon v. Dr. Winslow*, heard before Mr. Justice Denman and a special jury, concluded, after five days' hearing, in a verdict for the plaintiff with damages—for the assault (an attempt to convey her to the defendant's private asylum) 500*l.*, and for other charges arising out of that act one shilling; and they acquitted the defendant of all charge of malice. Both plaintiff and defendant appeared personally and conducted their case without counsel.

— A fire which rapidly threatened serious damage broke out at the brewery of Messrs. Barclay & Perkins, in Southwark Street, Borough, and, in spite of all efforts, could not be subdued until more than 10,000*l.* worth of property had been destroyed.

30. Severe snowstorms reported from the midland and northern counties, snow falling in places for fourteen hours consecutively. In some parts of Cheshire and North Wales traffic was for a time interrupted, but a rapid thaw set in and floods followed.

DECEMBER.

1. A meeting of the Liberal members of the House of Commons held at the Foreign Office to hear from Mr. Gladstone a statement with regard to the Redistribution Bill and the results of the Conference with the Conservative leaders.

— Systematic poisoning of foxes reported from the county Limerick and other foxhunting districts of Ireland.

— The Dublin Town Council decided by a considerable majority to change the name of their principal street, Sackville Street, to O'Connell Street.

2. A meeting of members of the Conservative party in both Houses held at the Carlton Club to receive a statement from Lord Salisbury with regard to the Redistribution Bill, and to the action of himself and Sir S. Northcote at the recent Conference. A general willingness was expressed to support the action of the party leaders.

— Three men, Thomas, Nash, and Gunnell, charged with conspiring to forge the will of James Whalley, involving nearly 60,000*l.*, terminated after a week's trial with the verdict of guilty against the first two prisoners, who were sentenced to fifteen years' penal servitude each.

3. Mr. H. M. Stanley delivered the opening address of the Scottish Geographical Society in the Music Hall, Edinburgh, taking for his subject geographical science as it affected Africa, and from an African traveller's standpoint.

— At the meeting of the Royal Society of Arts, Mr. W. H. Preece stated in the course of a lecture that electric lighting had made far more rapid progress in America than in the United Kingdom, there being upwards of 90,000 arc lights in nightly use in Canada and the United States. Incandescent lighting was not so popular, and in no case could electric lighting compete in price with gas; if it were to be adopted it would be on its own merits.

4. Thomas Dudley, captain, and Henry Stephens, mate, of the yacht *Mignonette*, against whom a special verdict had been found by the jury by the direction of Mr. Baron Huddleston at the Exeter Assizes, brought up before the Lord Chief Justice and bench of judges possessing the criminal jurisdiction of the old King's Bench. The Attorney General appeared for the crown, and many counsel on both sides. The Court, after hearing the arguments, held that the accused had been guilty of murder, and they were taken into custody and removed to Holloway Gaol, sentence being meanwhile deferred.

— The infant son of the Duchess of Albany, who had been privately baptized shortly after its birth, christened at Esher Parish Church, in the

presence of the Queen, the Prince and Princess of Wales, and other members of the Royal Family.

4. The elections to the vacant *fauteuils* at the Académie Française, M. Duruy the historian succeeding without opposition to that of M. Henri Martin; M. Bertrand to that of M. Dumas, the distinguished chemist; whilst for that of the Comte d'Haussonville, M. Ludovic Halévy was elected by a slight majority over M. Manuel.

5. The Balaton Lake in Hungary, the longest expanse of inland water in Europe, frozen over.

— A salmon, said to be the largest ever taken from a European river, netted in the Tay, a few miles above Perth. It measured five feet in length and two feet five inches in girth, and its estimated weight was about eighty pounds. It was a clean male fresh-run fish in first-rate condition. The fish was returned to the waters.

6. Serious fires took place at the Invert Sugar and Distillery Company, City Road, when a tank containing overproof spirit burst and ignited; at Sheerness, where further damage, attributed to incendiaries, was done to various blocks of buildings in different parts of the town; and at Glasgow, where the Bothwell Grain Stores were almost totally destroyed by fire.

— The stipendiary magistrate at Birmingham, before whom the charge of libel arising out of the Aston Riots was made, announced his intention not to commit the defendant for trial.

— Parliament adjourned to February 19, after having met to hear the Royal assent given to the Franchise Bill and other measures passed during the autumn session.

7. A terrible gale visited the western and south-western coasts of England and Ireland, and a large three-masted steamer, the *Pochard*, 1,135 tons, foundered soon after leaving the Mersey, with all hands. The screw-steamer *Alliance*, 1,000 tons, was also wrecked off Boscastle, with a loss of twenty lives.

8. Decision on Mr. C. Bradlaugh, M.P.'s motion for a new trial of the information laid against him on the part of the Crown, which when tried "at bar" had resulted in three penalties of 500*l.* each for having sat and voted in the House of Commons without having first taken the oath as prescribed by law. The Court, composed of the Lord Chief Justice (Coleridge), Mr. Justice Grove, and Baron Huddleston, after two days' argument adhered to the judgment given, and refused a new trial.

— Ernest Ewerstadt, a Russian sailor, condemned for the murder of a woman named Hamilton with whom he had lived at Liverpool, and Arthur Shaw, condemned for the murder of his wife, hanged in Kirkdale Gaol, Liverpool.

9. Sentence of death passed upon Dudley and Stephens, of the yacht *Mignonette*, for the murder of the boy Parker, whose life they had taken to support their own. The prisoners were subsequently respited during Her Majesty's pleasure.

— The polling at Knaresborough resulted in the return of Colonel Gunter (Conservative), by 319 votes over Mr. Holden (Liberal), 267.

— Judgment given by the Cairo Tribunal of First Instance in the action

brought by the Caisse of the Public Debt. The Government were condemned to refund the amounts illegally collected, and the chief ministers declared to be personally responsible.

9. The Skye crofters, who had apparently been soothed by hopes of legal redress, made a fresh demonstration of their impatience. An officer attempting to serve writs at Valtos, in the island of Lewis, was forcibly obstructed, and he and his assistants driven away by a crowd of several hundreds of crofters.

10. Vienna and several other districts of Austria were visited by a terrific hurricane. Roofs were blown off in all directions, market carts and cabs were overturned, and many of the trees in the Prater and Augarten were torn up. Two trains were thrown off the line between Vienna and Aspany. The only loss of life recorded was of two persons, but at least a dozen were seriously injured.

11. A terrible colliery accident occurred in a coal-pit near Temesvar, by which seventy-five of those who were in the mine were killed by an explosion of firedamp.

— An artilleryman, whilst fishing in the bay of Frioul, near Marseilles, caught on his line a large eel of the *Muræna* species. On attempting to drag it into the boat he was seized by the animal and so severely bitten that he swooned from loss of blood and pain, and his boat drifted until it was rescued by the custom-house officers.

12. Mr. H. H. Fowler, M.P. for Wolverhampton, appointed Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department, in succession to Mr. Hibbert, transferred to the post of Financial Secretary to the Treasury.

13. At the Treharris Colliery, near Merthyr Tydvil, whilst five night-workmen were being brought up the shaft, the rope broke, and the cradle falling to the bottom, four out of the five were killed; one escaping almost miraculously, having been able to seize the guide-rope, and to remain suspended in the shaft for several hours.

— The sentence of death pronounced on Dudley and Stephens for the murder of the boy Parker on board the *Mignonette* commuted to six months' imprisonment without hard labour.

— The centenary of Dr. Samuel Johnson's death commemorated by service at St. Clement Danes' Church, where the lexicographer had been during his lifetime a frequent attendant.

— About 5.45 P.M. an explosion took place under the second arch (Surrey side) of London Bridge. It was estimated that at least twenty pounds of dynamite had been lowered from the roadway, lighted with a time-fuse. A tremendous explosion of flame and noise ensued; many windows in the neighbourhood were shattered, and a few foot-passengers severely shaken, but no damage was done to the masonry of the bridge. Subsequent investigation, however, showed that the matter was far more serious. It was established that three men had hired a boat from one of the "hithes" near London Bridge, soon after four o'clock, when it was getting dark and close upon low water. They seem to have hoped to be able to insert their explosive machine in one of the holes made round the base-stones of the buttresses. These, however, had some months previously been covered with a heavy iron grating in anticipation of any attack, so that the conspirators were forced to fix their machine to the grating itself. After the tide was

about three-quarters of an hour flow the explosion took place, and the force was so great that large wooden balks which protect the masonry were found by the diver to have been smashed to pieces, the granite masonry sensibly displaced, and in many places large pieces broken off. A reward of 5,000*l.* for the discovery of the perpetrators of the outrage was voted by the Court of Common Council, but at the suggestion of the Home Secretary was withdrawn.

15. The trial of the men charged with attempting to kill the German Emperor and his suite at the unveiling of the Niederwald Monument on September 28, 1883, commenced before the Supreme Court of Leipzig. It appeared in the evidence that a drain was discovered crossing the road over which the Emperor had to pass. This was filled with dynamite, and a fuse attached; but it either missed fire or the courage of the conspirators failed them at the last moment.

16. A fire broke out in a large timber yard adjoining the Grand Junction Canal at Dalston, and got such hold of the material that it continued burning for several days, the efforts of the firemen being at last limited to the protection of neighbouring buildings.

— The World's Industrial Exhibition at New Orleans opened by President Arthur from Washington. Word was sent to him by telegraph at the White House, where were assembled the great officers of State, the diplomatic corps, and judges of the Supreme Court. The President, through a telegraphic instrument, declared the Exhibition open, and immediately the great engine was started other vast machinery was set in motion throughout the building at New Orleans.

17. A case, labelled "tin," was found among the goods landed at Dover from Calais by the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company's cargo boat. On opening it at the custom-house it was found to contain about two cwt. of dynamite. It was addressed as if intended for "Aden."

— The Bishop of Lincoln (Dr. Wordsworth), in a circular addressed to the clergy and laity of his diocese, announced his intention of retiring on the ground of ill-health and infirmity.

18. In the Court of Appeal, constituted of the Master of the Rolls, Lords Justices Cotton and Lindley, Mr. Bradlaugh's appeal against the refusal of the Queen's Bench to grant a new hearing of the trial at bar was rejected so far as the appeal related to the verdict being against evidence, but on the other points they deferred final judgment.

— M. François Coppée received at the French Academy, and pronounced the "eulogy" on his predecessor M. Laprade. The *discours de réception* was delivered by M. Caro.

— The Right Rev. Lord Plunket, Bishop of Meath, by a large majority of both clerical and lay members of synod, elected Archbishop of Dublin in the place of Archbishop Trench.

— St. John's Catholic Orphan Asylum caught fire, the flames spreading so rapidly that the retreat of a number of the inmates was cut off. One nun was killed in leaping from a window, and about twelve children were burnt to death.

18. Lucas Jauner, cashier of the Vienna Discount Bank, suddenly disappeared, defalcations to the amount of two millions of florins being subsequently discovered in his accounts. His body was found on the following day in the churchyard of Kierling.

19. Mrs. Elizabeth Gibbons convicted of the murder of her husband. The only evidence was medical, which showed that four or five shots of a revolver had been discharged at Gibbons, one of which from behind had entered beneath the left shoulder.

— The Imperial Supreme Court at Leipzig finally rejected the appeal of Madame de Kolomine, and confirmed the decree of divorce granted by the Court of Darmstadt. The grounds on which the decision was given were not stated, and Madame de Kolomine was condemned to pay the costs.

20. The eight days' sale of the Syston Park Library, belonging to Sir John Thorold, by Messrs. Sotheby, concluded, realising upwards of 28,000*l*. Amongst the important lots was a Mazarin Bible purchased for 3,900*l*., the highest price ever paid for a printed book; until a Codex Psalorum, printed by Fust and Gutenberg, sold for 4,050*l*. on the following day.

— According to a return issued, the shipbuilding trade, in which great depression prevailed, exhibited the following results :

		1881	1882	1883	1884
Clyde	Tonnage	341,022	391,934	419,664	296,854
Wear	{ Ships	80	123	134	70
	{ Tonnage	154,932	212,941	212,360	99,424

— A fire broke out in the parcels office of the Windsor Station of the Great Western Railway, which for a time was attributed to an infernal machine, but no evidence in support of this theory was found. A very serious destruction of property, chiefly Christmas presents, took place ; amongst other things a bride's wedding-dress, cake, &c., necessitating the postponement of the marriage.

21. A terrific gale swept over the northern parts of France, the English Channel, and southern counties, doing great damage to buildings and shipping. Paris suffered very severely.

22. Of the "Anarchists" tried at Leipzig for high treason and conspiracy to murder, the three principals, Reinsdorff, Rupsch, and Kùchler, were sentenced to death ; Holzbauer and Bachmann to ten years' imprisonment, and the remaining three acquitted. The only evidence was that given by the prisoners themselves.

— News arrived that the German flag had been hoisted on the northern coast of New Guinea, New Ireland, and on various islands of the South Pacific Archipelago.

— The sexcentenary of Peterhouse, Cambridge, celebrated. At the banquet given by the Master, Prince Albert Victor responded for the Royal Family, Lord Hartington for the Army, and Mr. Lowell for Harvard College, the oldest College in New England. The last-named in his speech alluded

to the fact that the day was also the anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers on Plymouth Rock 260 years previously.

22. A fire, which resulted in the death of three children, took place in Montague Street, Whitechapel, originating in the workshop of a carpenter.

— Seventeenth Conference of Headmasters held at Sherborne School, Dorset, and largely attended by the headmasters of the principal public schools.

23. Harrigan and Hart's Theatre, in Broadway, New York, commonly known as the Théâtre Comique, destroyed by fire. No lives were lost, there being no performance going on at the time.

— At Chester an accountant named Stevens and a servant named Pugh were committed on the charge of having performed a mock marriage, although the victim, a farm girl, expressed her willingness to accept Pugh's offer, made in open court, to marry her.

— At the Agricultural Hall, Islington, where an "Old English Fair" had been reproduced, after the type of Bartholomew or Stepney Fair, one of the caravans caught fire, and for a moment threatened the building with destruction. The fire brigade, however, were on the alert, and the fire was extinguished without extending to the adjoining booths.

25. Two vessels came into collision off the Eddystone Lighthouse, the steamship *Chelydra*, from Hiogo to Bremen, and the Norwegian barque *Holmstrand*, the steamer being cut amidships, and both going down within a few minutes. The crew of the steamer were picked up and landed at Plymouth in the evening, but nothing was heard of the crew of the *Holmstrand* for another day, when they also were picked up and brought safe to land.

— Two shocks of earthquake distinctly felt in Madrid, but no damage was done in the capital. In Andalusia, however, especially in the neighbourhood of Malaga, there was great destruction of life and property. The town of Albuñuelas, near Granada, was laid in ruins; and at Arenas del Rey the damage was very serious. The lowest estimate gave 300 lives lost, whilst others were as high as 1,000. At Periana, in the province of Malaga, a landslip of a mountain took place, involving the neighbouring inhabitants in frightful disaster. The façade of the cathedral of Granada was damaged, and the Giralda at Seville also showed traces of the violence of the shocks.

26. The financial panic at Vienna, which had led already to the suicide of two bank officials, and of Laibach the director, brought about the collapse of the firm Woltitz Brothers, corn-dealers. After an interview with their creditors, the brothers took a cab and drove to Heimberg, where they had offices. The clerks heard soon after one report of a pistol, and entering into the room found the two brothers quite dead, and near them two revolvers, of each of which one barrel had been discharged.

27. No less than ten lives lost in South-West Lancashire alone by accidents on the ice.

— In consequence of the commercial depression affecting the metal trade, the steel works of Messrs. Bolckow, Vaughan & Co., at Eston, closed for an indefinite period.

27. H.M.S. *Seahorse* left Strome Ferry for Valtos, in the island of Lewis ; and by a combination of skill and secrecy, and a display of force (about eighty marines), nine of the principal ringleaders in the "deforcement" case were arrested, and in spite of the excitement aroused were successfully carried off to the mainland.

29. Swakeleys, a fine old Jacobean manor-house at Ickenham, near Uxbridge, built by Sir Edmund Wright, Lord Mayor in 1638, narrowly escaped destruction by fire, the ball-room and one valuable picture being totally destroyed. Harrington, the regicide, had at one time been the owner of Swakeleys, and by him it was sold to Sir Robert Vyner, to whom Pepys paid a visit in 1665.

— The Queen gave her consent to the engagement of her daughter the Princess Beatrice with Prince Henry of Battenberg, third son of Prince Alexander of Hesse, with the condition that the Prince and Princess should reside in England, and in close proximity to Her Majesty.

— Mrs. Gibbons, who had been convicted of the murder of her husband at Hayes, respited, and her sentence commuted to penal servitude for life.

— The Queen conferred the ribbon of St. Patrick on Lords Annaly and Montéagle, and that of the Grand Cross of the Bath on Lord Aberdare.

30. At the Dorothea Quarry, Nantill, near Carmarthen, a great fall of rock killed seven men instantaneously, and seriously injured others.

— Fresh shocks of earthquake at various intervals reported from the South of Spain. At the town of Alhama upwards of a thousand houses were reported to be in ruins, and several other towns in the provinces of Malaga and Granada suffered almost as severely. The loss of life was estimated at upwards of one thousand.

— Lord Wolseley's advance guard under Sir Herbert Stewart (a camel corps) started from Korti on its march across the desert to Shendy, and General Earle almost simultaneously left Abu Hamad to punish the Monassir tribe.

31. Two serious fires, one at Peckham and the other in Clare Market, occurred, and in each case four lives were lost, the flames getting possession of the buildings (lodging-houses) before assistance could be procured, and cutting off the retreat of the inmates.

— Shortly before midnight the clock outside the Observatory at Greenwich was so altered that, instead of indicating twelve o'clock when the neighbouring clocks were striking that hour, it pointed to zero. By this arrangement the Astronomer Royal took the first step towards adopting "the universal day," and making the commencement of the astronomical day coincident with the civil day.

RETROSPECT

OF

LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART IN 1884.

LITERATURE.

PERSONAL biographies and autobiographies occupied a very important place in the year's literature ; not only from their number, but from the prominent position of persons who either write of themselves or are written about.

The **Memoirs of an ex-Minister, by Lord Malmesbury** (Longmans), attracted much attention. The autobiography of a statesman of the first rank is in itself not of common occurrence, but it is rare indeed to find the work published in the lifetime of the author. The reasons for this are not far to seek, and the chiefest among them is a consideration for the feelings of others, which might be sorely wounded by a too prompt divulgence of anecdote or of fact. The present volumes, while replete with interest, can, we imagine, wound the feelings of no one ; and the change of scene from England to the Continent, and from keen political conflict in the Houses of Parliament to the wild scenery of Heron Court, is especially grateful to the reader. The conclusion which will, we think, be generally arrived at on a perusal of this work is, that Lord Malmesbury's life has been singularly full of variety and of interest. Though he was prevented by reason of the somewhat strange views held by his father from ever obtaining a seat in the House of Commons, and so missed the earlier training which has been of such inestimable advantage to many of our hereditary legislators, he almost immediately after his succession to the title entered into most intimate relations with Lord Stanley, which were continued up to the time of the latter's death in 1869. In Lord Derby's two ministries of 1852 and 1858-9 he held the post of Foreign Secretary, and was also Lord Privy Seal in Lord Derby's third administration, and in the first and a portion of the second administration of Lord Beaconsfield. Very interesting and instructive are the glimpses behind the scenes which the author occasionally affords us, more especially of the position taken up by Lord Derby on the question of Free Trade in 1852, and the consequent refusal of Lord Palmerston to join his Government, a refusal which has without doubt had far-reaching consequences for the Conservative party. These volumes moreover form a valuable sequel to the "Diary and Correspondence of the First Earl of Malmesbury."

The **Correspondence and Diaries of the late Right Hon. John Wilson Croker**, Secretary to the Admiralty from 1809 to 1830, edited by Louis J. Jennings (Murray), in point of political and historical interest probably exceed in importance any others published during the year.

Not only are many of the letters both of Mr. Croker and his correspondents admirable as literary compositions, but they also deal with subjects of genuine interest not only to the student of history but also to the general reader.

Mr. Croker was born in 1780, and at the early age of twenty-eight he became Secretary to the Admiralty in Mr. Perceval's administration, retaining that post for the long period of twenty-one years, and only leaving the office in 1830 in consequence of the advent of Earl Grey and the Whigs to power.

During that time, and indeed to the end of his life, he was thrown in contact with many of the foremost men of the day. With the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, in particular, he was on terms of peculiar intimacy, an intimacy which in the former case lasted till the death of the great Duke in 1852, and in the latter was destined to be rudely broken by the legislation of 1846.

The political intrigues which preceded the formation of Mr. Canning and Lord Goderich's cabinets in 1827 are, as may be believed, the subject of much interesting correspondence, and throw fresh light on the state of parties at that time.

Altogether we cannot doubt that these volumes will have the effect of raising Mr. Croker in the estimation of the reader. He has hitherto suffered much from political caricature, and has been the subject of ill-natured and mendacious gossip which, in the absence of authentic information, has passed current for fact. If these letters do nothing else, they will at least show that few men have been more undeservedly maligned than the writer.

It is twenty-five years since ~~Mountstuart~~ **Elphinstone** died, but the record of his distinguished life which Sir E. Colebrooke has given us (Murray) is as important now as it would have been if published long ago. Especially is it useful at the present moment to see what one who so largely assisted in the formation of our Indian Empire thought of such questions as the rights of natives; the kind of government suited to the country; and the desirability of annexations. Sir E. Colebrooke's work is founded on the Indian journals and the official and other correspondence freely confided to him, and his task has been done with the most adequate taste and skill—there is nothing confidential or personal printed that should not have been made public, and yet all that is necessary for tracing the growth of character and for understanding the career of the great statesman is frankly laid before us.

The public part of Lord Elphinstone's life belongs to history, and as far as the Mahratta wars are concerned, in which he played so important a part, especially to Indian history; but there is much in these volumes of interest to those who are not students of that subject. "He was essentially a man of thought as well as of action," says his biographer, "for his love of letters and his thirst for knowledge were intense." The lines of the Persian poet whom he delighted in were the motto taken and acted on throughout his life :—

"O Hafiz ! do not allow your life to be passed in vain ;
Strive and obtain some result from your life."

And in the midst of a busy career of responsibilities of every kind he found time for a daily study of the classics, and for omnivorous reading of all kinds. The Strachey correspondence is among the most interesting of the book,

which is full of every kind of human interest ; for "the forgetfulness of self, which made Lord Elphinstone so truly public-minded, was the charm of his private life, and constituted a character at once to be admired and loved."

The two volumes on **Thomas Carlyle** giving his life in London from 1839-1881 (Longmans), which Mr. Froude has brought out, complete the series. We may say at once that there is nothing in them to make one reverse the judgment formed by the perusal of the previous seven ; and much repetition of petty incidents makes the reading somewhat tedious. That Carlyle should never have married—being too much occupied in "getting life lived" to have time for any closeness of personal relationship with its inevitable demands—is the verdict on his domestic life that no one can avoid arriving at. The incident in the opening volume of the burning of a volume of the "French Revolution," and his conduct under such an ordeal, bring out how heroic he could be in important things, and offers a strange contrast to the want of heroism—nay, the pitiable loss of self-control—with which he met the smaller details of everyday life. The limitations, too, of his intellectual character in his bitter judgments of men for whose opinions he had no sympathy are brought out here as in former volumes, showing a strange lack of imagination ; but, on the other hand, when his temperament and character were in accord with his mental perceptions, then we get the clearness of vision of a seer, expressed in language of rugged force startling in its revelations.

To many minds of this generation, not wanting in power either, the struggle between instinct and reason, between the bias of sympathy and intellectual truth, is often a severe one ; but Carlyle was torn by no such conflict ; mind and emotion ran together in a deep and narrow channel, the banks of which were far too high to admit of any divergence of course.

There is little sympathy with Mr. Froude apparently in the way in which he has fulfilled the difficult trust confided to him. That he should have waited longer, and digested his material, finally giving to the world a record that would not have injured the reputation of a man whom it had elevated into a hero, and worshipped as such, is the remark so frequently heard. It is a difficult question to solve, and undoubtedly much of the reading he has provided us with makes one shrink with regret from the handling in minute detail of personal relationships ; but, on the other hand, there is a conscientiousness about the record which one feels is hardly ever attained in biographies, and which can certainly not be attained without the attendant drawback pervading much that is painful.

The closing chapters of the second volume in which Carlyle's end is foreshadowed are written with great tenderness, and the account of the important trust committed to him, and how he dealt with it from the first, can only decide us in thinking that Mr. Froude, though he may have committed an error of judgment, has at least acted as he has done, in giving to the world everything concerning his friend, from the conviction that Carlyle had thereby to gain rather than to lose ; and, indeed, when one thinks that everything has really been given, one can only ask what life is there of all we know in public or private which could stand the test as Carlyle's life has done.

The **Life of F. D. Maurice**, edited by his son (Macmillan), ought to have appeared some years since if it was to meet with the enthusiasm which for long encircled anything connected with his name.

But Maurice's reputation was one of those founded on a personality, and on that is the case it behoves a biographer not to wait until the impressions

left by the man himself are in any way dimmed. The two volumes in which Colonel Maurice writes of his father are very different from most of the biographies of the day, in that intimate relations are hardly touched on at all, and all letters are rigorously excluded that deal with his more private life and character. This is particularly unfortunate in the case of a man like Maurice, whose personal influence brought him into such close relationship with so many; for it was not as a theologian or as a controversialist that he was famous, but almost entirely as a man of earnest truthfulness, whose power of speech compelled the thoughtful to turn in upon themselves and endeavour to give a reason for the faith that was in them.

The biographical portions of the account are interesting and fully given, and the controversial side of Maurice's life is very adequately treated; but the memoir lacks human interest. The obscurity about the expression of his religious views, the want of definite system in his religious teaching, hindered Maurice from contributing anything permanent to theology; but the suggestive power of the man himself was an influence that spread far and wide, and helped largely to bring about that change in the religious world which seems already, after twelve short years, to know him no more.

Memoirs of Life and Work (Smith, Elder, & Co.), by Dr. Charles J. B. Williams, is the personal narrative of the distinguished physician whom Dr. Quain speaks of as "the principal founder of our modern school of pathology." He entered Edinburgh University in 1820, and established himself in London in 1830. With regard to his professional life, his researches on pulmonary diseases constitute perhaps his most important work. His book on "Diseases of the Chest" and his "Principles of Medicine" retain a high place in the literature of medicine.

Apart from his strictly professional work, he devoted much time to scientific investigation, to which he was greatly stimulated by intercourse with Faraday.

He held the Professorship of Medicine at University College for ten years; he was first President both of the Pathological and New Sydenham Societies, President of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society, and consulting physician from its foundation to the Brompton Consumption Hospital. His action for libel against the Duke and Duchess of Somerset, which ended in full retraction, with costs for the plaintiff, is among the interesting chapters of the book.

A vein of strong religious sentiment runs through all the account of his life, the final chapter being devoted entirely to subjects not secular.

Mr. Payn's **Literary Recollections** (Smith, Elder, & Co.) are very pleasant reading. A portion of them appeared in the *Cornhill*; but their form is changed and much new matter is added. Such a book is very acceptable in the midst of lengthy autobiographies and memoirs. Mr. Payn has recognised that his life is not eventful enough to go down in full with dates and diary, and so has confined himself to such parts of his literary career as are really interesting and to his intercourse with people like the Chambers, Miss Mitford, Miss Martineau, Trollope, Dickens, Reade, and others, of whom we can never hear too much. There are some excellent stories too, and the whole is full of such good-humour and so deficient in discontent of any kind, and in depreciatory remarks on life in general or particular individuals, that we rise from its perusal with a sense of gratitude. Perhaps the two most interesting chapters are those on Miss Martineau and Dickens, with both of whom the writer had an intimate friendship; his outspoken

condemnation of those who cannot greatly admire Dickens may make some of us a little uncomfortable ; but Mr. Payn is so genuine and hearty in his appreciation that we readily forgive his severity on that score. On the whole, life must have been very satisfactory to him, which is, perhaps, not surprising when we see the pleasant humour and contented lightness with which he has faced it.

Mr. Yates has led a by no means commonplace life ; he has mixed with many interesting people, has seen many strange sights, has attended some gorgeous functions, and, last but not least, has known how to take advantage of his opportunities. Hence the two amusing volumes before us of *Recollections and Experiences* (Bentley), which, though destitute of the political and historic interest which will attach to the biographies of Lord Malmesbury and John Wilson Croker, are yet full of interest of a more evanescent kind.

One reads few papers without lighting on some amusing anecdote or *bon mot*, or little piece of character-drawing, all excellent in their way, and told with such a charming *bonhomie* that the reader at last begins to wonder whether Mr. Yates was ever out of temper in his life.

As a specimen of the good taste with which the author deals with incidents personal to himself, we may instance the chapter on the subject of his dispute with the Garrick Club. No one, we think, can finish this without feeling that Mr. Yates was hardly used, but there is not a trace of rancour in the narrative, and although many years have passed since the event took place, few people, situated as he was, would, we think, have written of it with such absolute impartiality. The volumes are altogether well and easily written, and throughout most lively and amusing.

Mr. Gallenga's *Episodes of My Second Life* (Chapman & Hall) is another instance of the representation of men of letters by themselves, but is a more solid and important contribution to that species of literature than the two previous books mentioned. What strikes one in this flow of confessions, memoirs, and reminiscences of every description, is that nowadays those who have gained a position in literature make money in their lifetime out of their connections and friendships and the *personnel* that their semi-public life has brought them, instead of leaving it to their posterity. That, however, is a matter of taste. No doubt the autobiographical journal adds a certain piquancy to, while it assuredly detracts in no way from, the remembrance of such of their experiences as have an interest for the public.

Mr. Gallenga has had a most chequered career, and now at the age of seventy, as he tells us, he sits down to write it all out, and without the aid of diary or notes, for these he never kept. His second life dates from his change of nationality in 1856, when, in consequence of exile through his performances as an Italian Liberal and youthful conspirator at Parma, he determined to try his fortunes in America. He was not successful there as an Italian teacher, in which capacity he hoped to make his way, but as a lecturer was decidedly popular, and all he tells us of American society—Longfellow, Emerson, Ticknor, and Prescott—is very lively and interesting.

He came to England, where his reception was not much more enthusiastic than in the States, and his first literary engagement was with the *Metropolitan Magazine* at 3s. 11½d. a page. But a book on modern Italy gave him an introduction to London society, and he formed friendships with Carlyle, Bulwer, Lady Morgan, Lady Blessington, and W. S. Landor. He accepted the professorship at Halifax in Canada, then came back to England, then

returned to Italy for the revolution of 1848, and served in the war. His connection with the *Times* dates from the Franco-Austrian war, ever since which time he has worked hard for it in different capacities.

There is a great deal of gossip in the book, and vivaciously told, but Mr. Gallenga's connection with politics in his own country was a not insignificant one, and there is a good deal of solid matter interspersed with the narrative of his career. He was a rolling stone from the first, but he gathered plenty of moss, as these volumes show.

Mr. Ornsby's *Memoirs of Mr. Hope Scott, of Abbotsford* (Murray) will interest many, not only of the generation which is passing away and who numbered Mr. Hope Scott among their contemporaries, but also of the rising generation who knew him by repute only as one of the most successful, if not the most successful, Parliamentary advocate of his day. He came from a good stock, and no doubt owed some of his earlier success to his connections, but he was a man of learning, ability, and eloquence, and his advancement, although probably hastened by the kindness of his friends, could not have been long delayed.

His early life both at College and at London was much influenced by his High Church proclivities, Oxford being then in the full whirl of the Tractarian movement, and his close friendships with Manning and Newman tended gradually to alienate him from the English Church until many years after, when in middle life he was received into the Church of Rome.

His correspondence, of which there is much and of great variety scattered through the volumes before us, is often of great interest. Mr. Gladstone was numbered amongst his best and dearest friends, and their letters, especially those referring to Mr. Gladstone's article on Church and State, the proof-sheets of which were read and criticised throughout by his friend, are full of importance.

The biographer has performed a task of some difficulty and delicacy, considering Mr. Hope Scott's relations with many still living, with great propriety and success.

Mr. Julian Hawthorne's narrative of his father's life, called *Nathaniel Hawthorne and his Wife* (Chatto & Windus), does not give a very pleasant picture of the man whom Mr. Henry James's sketch delighted us with so thoroughly, but we are grateful to him for revealing to us the life and character of his mother, who has hitherto been cast into the shade by the prominence given to the husband to whom she was so devoted. The father's egotism, his hatred of things English, his discontent at his adopted country, his vanity and spleen are not concealed in this biography, which is rather a supplement to existing notices of Hawthorne than a complete life. But Mr. Hawthorne's letters are delightful, full of humour and kindness, and the sketch of the Hawthorne home when Nathaniel was a boy enables us to grasp in some measure how it was that his genius developed in such an eccentric way. The portraits in the book, which are not few in number, and the stock of letters hitherto unpublished, give it a distinct claim to importance.

The second series of *Leaves from the Diary of Henry Greville* (Smith, Elder, & Co.), edited by the Viscountess Enfield, his niece, embraces the period from 1852 to 1856. It gives a very accurate record of the events which occurred almost from day to day leading to and during the war in the Crimea, of the views of the distinguished politicians, both English and foreign, on the events of that time, and also reflects the state of opinion in England and abroad.

In memoirs of this sort some amusing and clever stories are recorded which would not find a place in a studied history. The very extensive acquaintance of the writer with eminent persons of every shade of opinion, both here and on the Continent, and his minute observation of all that interested the public mind during the period embraced, give his diary a certain zest which will not only be found agreeable to readers of the present day, but will commend it to students of our history in the future.

The **Letters of the Rev. J. M. Mozley**, edited by his sister (Rivingtons), are full of strong personal interest, and form a further contribution to the literature of the Tractarian movement of which recent years have given us so many reminiscences. His life may be clearly seen in this volume, for, as his sister says, "a series of letters in chronological order usually grows into a biography without any such design in the selector." Notwithstanding that, she adds, her selection includes letters of a more private character than are generally given to the world, the correspondence is singularly impersonal; but perhaps that makes one all the more ready to appreciate the clearness with which the portraits of Newman, Keble, and others stand out before the reader. Mozley's literary judgments, too, are interesting. Macaulay, George Eliot, Mrs. Norton, Ruskin, and many more are described as regards their authorship with trenchant but kindly criticism. The greater part of the letters were written while he belonged to the Oxford movement; those belonging to the time of his severance from the High Church party, his Bampton lectureship and canonry of Worcester, forming a comparatively small part of the collection. The Editor's selection has been most carefully and successfully made, the volume being kept within very reasonable limits.

The number of biographies and memoirs is so large that it is impossible to do more than simply allude to some of them. Mr. Reid gives **A Sketch of the Life and Times of Sydney Smith** (Sampson Low), which he intends "to supplement and not to rival the biography which is already before the world." That he supplements as well as draws largely from Lady Holland's memoir is true enough, but a good deal of his further intention "to paint the figure of Sydney Smith against the background of his times" is marred by his tilting against a fiction of his own mind—namely, a constant disparagement by those who ought to know better of the private life of the great wit. It is needless to say that the book is full of anecdotes and interesting letters.

Mr. Humphry Ward has completed a memoir of **Dr. Humphry Sandwith**, from the autobiographical notes of his uncle (Cassell). It is distinctly a personal memoir, but at the same time contains no indiscreet revelations and very little that is trivial or unimportant. After passing his medical examinations, Mr. Sandwith went to Constantinople for his health, and became physician to the Embassy there. He had a brief engagement as correspondent of the *Times*, terminated only through his love and support of Turkish rule. His exploit with Colonel Williams at Kars he himself narrated in the "Siege of Kars," but how he was received on his return meets with fuller detail in this volume. He accompanied Dr. Granville as physician on his special embassy to Russia in 1856, and in 1857 went to Mauritius as Colonial Secretary. Throwing this appointment up in disgust, he spent the remainder of his life in retirement, but not in inactivity, for he was most assiduous in nursing the sick during the Franco-German, Servian, and Russo-Turkish wars. His nephew has given a most interesting account of

one whom he describes as "a leader in the irregular forces which humanity enlists in her behalf, in the dismal campaigns against tyranny, barbarism, and wrong."

Lady Bloomfield's memoir of her father-in-law, **Benjamin Lord Bloomfield** (Chapman & Hall), is not so successful as her "Reminiscences of Court and Diplomatic Life." It is the record of Lord Bloomfield's residence at Stockholm, as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, which began now sixty years ago—founded on his private diary and official correspondence—and we cannot think, with the editor, that the relations of England and Sweden at the time are of sufficient public and historical interest to justify their publication.

Mr. Austin Dobson reprints in an attractive form his articles on **Bewick and his Pupils**, prepared in 1881 for the *New York Century Magazine* (Chatto & Windus), with many reproductions of the great wood-engraver's art.

In **Biographical Essays** (Longmans) Professor Max Müller collects some very interesting material—some of which has been published in the shape of magazine articles—on his Japanese pupils at Oxford, Bunyiu Nanjio and Kenjiu Kasawara, the latter of whom died immediately on his return to his country; the great German scholar, Julius Mohl, Keshub Chunder Sen, of whom he writes with personal knowledge, and other well-known names.

The most interesting essays are those on the three Indian religious reformers, Rājāh Rāmmohun, the founder of the Brahmo-Somaj, who died fifty years ago, and on whom Professor Max Müller delivered his address last year in London; and Dayananda Sarasvati, a kind of Pusey among the modern sects in India, and subject to much persecution on that account. These two he knew only in the spirit, but Chunder Sen, the third, and the successor and follower of Rāmmohun, was an intimate friend, and in consequence his study is a more finished one. That on Colebrooke, the great Sanscrit scholar, is a warm attempt to gain for him a recognition worthy of his work; but the one on Kingsley, which concludes the volume, is too weak to deserve a place among so much that is vigorous.

The **Posthumous Memoirs of Caroline Bauer** (Remington) form a very curious chapter in autobiography. The daughter of a German officer, she was brought up to the stage, and very quickly attained to considerable fame. In 1828 Prince Leopold, afterwards King of the Belgians, was struck by her success, and procured an introduction. He soon after proposed marriage, and, supported in his arguments by Baron Stockmar, her cousin and his intimate friend, she left the stage, and came to the house provided in London for her. The relationship is naturally told with much bitterness, and with a view to injure the reputation of the Prince and Stockmar, as no doubt it will do, the facts being essentially correct. As a matter of justice, a kind of sham ceremony was at length performed, but the petty distrust and niggardliness of the Prince in regard to her brother put the last touch to her indignation at what she had been tricked into, and she left London in 1830. One is glad to know that she returned to the stage, where she remained till 1849, when she married a Polish Count.

The **Fifty Years of Public Works**, by the late Sir Henry Cole (Bell & Sons), is not, as has been assumed by some reviewers, a biography. It is strictly an account of the public works which Sir Henry undertook. Salient amongst these were the Postal and Record Office Reforms, Art Manufactures, Special and International Exhibitions, including, of course,

the parent "Great Exhibition of 1851," from which, and from Sir Henry's connection with Schools of Design, sprang the Science and Art Department and the South Kensington Museum, of which he was mainly the creator.

The volumes contributed during the year to the *Eminent Women Series* (Allen & Co.) are the Countess of Albany, by Vernon Lee; Mrs. Fry, by Mrs. Pitman.

Vernon Lee has produced a very graphic and interesting account of a woman who assuredly was not eminent, but who, from character and circumstances, deserves the tribute of a memoir.

As the young wife of the once brilliant and fascinating Charles Edward, when he was no longer either one or the other, but a drunken and degraded man, she had many claims to pity and sympathetic appreciation of the dignity with which she bore an intolerable existence.

As the friend of Alfieri—the poet whose egotism has never been rivalled, and with whom she had a relationship, curiously blended of passion and coldness—she is more interesting, though less unfortunate.

It is a pity that Vernon Lee, who has the great gift of presenting a most life-like picture of what she describes, does not check her tendency to extravagance of colouring, to excess of adjectives, to a style that in its attempt to be facile often verges on scene-painting without its illusions. But the extent of vocabulary is really surprising, and in this narrative the sentences are not so involved, and do not make such demands upon the patient intelligence of the reader, as in her longer and more important works.

Mrs. Fry is adequately treated by Mrs. Pitman. It is difficult to realise justly, now that women have penetrated into so many spheres hitherto closed to them, and indeed almost taken as their own the large field of practical philanthropy, what an innovation was made by the quiet Quaker lady when she bent her mind towards prison reform, and persistently left the beaten tracks prescribed for women by society and custom.

Miss Martineau is written about with much sympathy by Mrs. Fenwick Miller, and will prove among the most attractive volumes of the series. It is a useful supplement to Miss Martineau's autobiography, for it relates much that is new, and also gives the right emphasis to certain passages in her life, as her engagement, which, from the lapse of time between her loss and that in which she wrote, is barely mentioned by her.

Mrs. Miller is very successful in showing how her strong character was wrought of trial under physical disabilities, and a determination not to be beaten in the struggle with life and happiness, together with the influence of the Martineau home and its atmosphere. The estimate of Harriet Martineau's intellectual life is the weakest part of the book, and if Mrs. Miller had allowed the subject of her biography to speak more through letters and personal narrative, the result would have been more satisfactory.

The poetry of the year has brought forward nothing remarkable. We are accustomed to the annual volume by Mr. Swinburne and Mr. Browning, and so far have not been disappointed, though with both it is of smaller dimensions than usual.

A Midsummer Holiday (Chatto & Windus) shows Mr. Swinburne's tendency to get more obscure as he gets older—to let the accompaniment of the words overpower the thought contained in them—but it includes some poems of great power and charm of expression. He touches the subject of childhood with the delicacy and tenderness that we met with in a previous

volume, and the sea now, as ever, is the great part of nature with which he feels most sympathy—for which he yearns with a personal longing.

One of the first series is "In Sepulcretis," a protest against the modern habit of biography, with its want of sacred feeling for personal relationships and its desire to lay bare what the silence of death should cover :—

" But now, when death and fame have set one seal
On tombs whereat Love, Grief and Glory kneel,
Men sift all secrets, in their critic sieve,
Of graves wherein the dust of death might shrink
To know what tongues defile the dead man's name
With loathsome love, and praise that stings like shame.
Rest once was theirs, who had crossed the mortal brink :
No rest, no reverence now : dull fools undress
Death's holiest shrine, life's veriest nakedness."

Love and scorn are likewise the subject of some very fine verses which remind us of the best of Poems and Ballads, without their want of restraint of language. The seaside town of Cromer has several poems devoted to it, which will memorialise its past attractiveness after the new railway—now in progress of construction—has reduced it to the level of a tripper's watering-place.

We must not omit to mention a controversial part of the volume devoted to abuse of our hereditary legislators ; but, apart from regret that Mr. Swinburne is so filled with anguish, there is not much to be derived from it.

A long ode to Victor Hugo is the most difficult and obscure in the volume ; nor does its literary merit appear to counterbalance this drawback. On the other hand the verses on the death of Richard Doyle are an admirable specimen of appreciative and self-contained eulogy, than which nothing could be more attractive :—

" A light of blameless laughter, fancy-bred,
Soft-souled and glad and kind as love or sleep,
Fades, and sweet mirth's own eyes are fain to weep
Because her blithe and gentlest bird is dead.
Weep, elves and fairies all, that never shed
Tear yet for mortal mourning : you that keep
The doors of dreams whence nought of ill may creep,
Mourn once for one whose lips your honey fed.
Let waters of the Golden River steep
The rose-roots whence his grave blooms rosy-red
And murmuring of Hyblæan hives be deep
About the summer silence of its bed,
And nought less gracious than a violet peep
Between the grass grown greener round his head."

Mr. Browning certainly does not write that those who run may read, but *Ferishtah's Fancies* (Smith, Elder, & Co.) is not so obscure as many of his preceding writings which deal, like this volume, with the great questions of human destiny. It is disguised with a very thin veil of Orientalism, but that pertains to the form only ; actually it is little more than a string of stories dealing with the problems of life.

The prologue, in which Mr. Browning likens his poem to the ortolan as it is cooked in Italy when wrapped up between layers of toast and pungent sage

leaves, does not offer a complete analogy, for the delicate morsel in the shape of a charming lyric, which follows upon each story, but is completely detached from it, will, we expect, be read by many who will leave the philosophy on one side; for Ferishtah the Dervish and instructor of youth is not so clear a teacher as he might be, though many jewels be hid in his discourse.

But the general aim of his philosophy is unmistakable. Amidst the profound obscurity which encompasses so much of life there is but one safe beacon—faith in the Divine element overlooking, somewhere and somehow, human life in its perplexity. Whether this life is on the whole a good thing or a bad thing is discussed with much ingenuity in the story called "A Bean Stripe," the solution being that light and shadow are so inextricably blended that each modifies the other so persistently that neither black nor white prevails if only we do not pause at a given moment, but extend our gaze along the whole line of life.

"Choose a joy!

Bettered it was by sorrow gone before,
And sobered somewhat by the shadowy sense
Of sorrow which came after or might come.
Joy, sorrow,—by precedence, subsequence—
Either on each, make fusion, mix in Life
That 's both and neither wholly : grey or dun ?
Dun thou decidest ? grey prevails, say I :
Wherefore ? Because my view is wide enough,
Reaches from first to last nor winks at all :
Motion achieves it : stop short—fast we stick,—
Probably at the bean that 's blackest."

The allegory of the two camels is a very humorous protest against asceticism. The one camel who tried to save his master the cost of his provender died before his journey was ended, while the other, who had realised that the day's work could only be done by taking his rations, earned his master's praise.

"Do thy day's work, dare

Refuse no help thereto,—since help refused
Is hindrance sought and found. Win but the race—
Who shall object 'He tossed three wine cups off,
And, just at starting, Lilith kissed his lips ?'

The lyrics that form an epilogue to each story are in the author's best style, and remind one—in their grace and sweetness, combined with the vigour that is never absent from Mr. Browning's poetry—of the verses that charmed us nearly half a century ago.

Lord Tennyson seems to have forsaken narrative verse for the drama. In his dedication of *Becket* (Macmillan) to Lord Selborne, he says that it is "not intended in its present form to meet the exigencies of our modern theatre," and yet its dramatic qualities far exceed those of the "Cup" and the "Falcon" and "Harold." It has many very fine passages—gems of the purest water—that remain in one's mind, and make one wish the setting were of a finer quality. Such a one is the speech of Becket in the first act, when, having been made Primate almost against his will, he feels the responsibilities of his change of office.

BECKET.

“ Am I the man ? That rang
 Within my head last night, and when I slept
 Methought I stood in Canterbury Minster,
 And spake to the Lord God, and said, ‘ O Lord,
 I have been a lover of wines and delicate meats,
 And secular splendours, and a favourer
 Of players, and a courtier, and a feeder
 Of dogs and hawks, and apes, and lions and lynxes:
 Am I the man ? ’ And the Lord answer’d me,
 ‘ Thou art the man, and all the more the man.’
 And then I ask’d again, ‘ O Lord my God,
 Henry the King hath been my friend, my brother,
 And mine uplifter in the world, and chosen me
 For this Thy great archbishopric, believing
 That I should go against the Church with him,
 And I shall go against him with the Church,
 And I have said no word of this to him :
 Am I the man ? ’ And the Lord answer’d me,
 ‘ Thou art the man, and all the more the man.’
 And thereupon, methought, *He* drew toward me,
 And smote me down upon the minster floor.”

But the introduction of very laboured prose, with the rough jests and play upon words that we meet with in Shakespeare’s plays, is not Tennysonian, nor does it harmonise with the literary art and feeling of the age. We are annoyed, after reading such passages as the above, at being pulled up by the vagaries in speech of Walter Map, or the page and a half of pseudo-comic prose in which the maid who has been chosen to attend on Rosamund in her bower prologues the entrance of her mistress.

In dealing with Rosamund, Lord Tennyson has departed from history—a rather legendary history—both in making her completely innocent and ignorant of her real position, and in the intervention of Becket when Eleanor, having discovered her bower, is about to stab her. The dramatic moment of the archbishop’s appearance is obtained at the expense of the romantic interest which generally centres in her tragic fate. The strong part of the play lies in the characterisation of Becket ; his courage and force of character when, having accepted the office of Primate, he feels that he can no longer serve the King against the Church, as he did while Chancellor ; his regret at the loss of the old friendship, his steadfast facing of the coming martyrdom are all signalised in lines of great force and clearness.

On the other hand, the opportunities for lyric sweetness in the scenes between Henry and Rosamund have been neglected. Henry is so engrossed with his quarrel with Becket that he forgets to make love, and remains unresponsive to Rosamund’s affection. Yet there is one song that opens the second act, clear-cut and musical in rhythm, which is equal to any that the poet has ever written. Only it makes us discontented at its uniqueness in the drama, and prompts regret that so perfect a lyric writer should have forsaken the field in which he is so excellent.

Becket’s is the only character in the play that is a complete conception. Rosamund’s is a mere shadow beside it ; while of Henry only his violent

temper, and of Eleanor only her jealous vengeance, are brought forward into prominence. But a more important want in the play, and all that mars its unity, is that the episode of Rosamund has no integral importance, and is not bound up in any way with that which forms its chief feature—the rise and fall of Becket.

It is for its lyrics and isolated passages of great beauty that “Becket” will remain admirable to posterity, and not as a great tragedy or historical drama.

A new volume of poems comes to us from Mr. J. A. Symonds, in his enforced exile. *Wagabunduli Libellus* he calls it (Kegan Paul)—the little book of a wanderer, and addressed therefore to any one in tune with its mood. It consists of sonnets only—a considerable section of which, entitled “*Stella Maris*,” is intended to supplement the last volume of “*Animi Figura*.” “*Stella Maris*” is a sonnet sequence. “The portrait of a beauty-loving and impulsive, but at the same time self-tormenting and conscientious mind, which I attempted to display in ‘*Animi Figura*,’” says the author in his preface, “was incomplete and inexplicable without the episode of passionate experience set forth in ‘*Stella Maris*.’” The key-note is struck in the following sonnet, No. 33 of the series :—

“Is love that last supremest consummation,
That final concord when all powers agree,
Commingle thought with sense, setting self free,
Soothing the tyrant will with joy’s oblation?
No need to pause for doubt or consultation;
Three wrangling partners in man’s empery
Brief parley made, proclaim their jubilee;
Love, only love, fulfils life’s aspiration!
True : but how rare, how mystical a jewel
Must that love be which, ‘mid the vex’d confusion
Of sense, will, reason, shields the soul from peril!
How sinister, how ruinously cruel,
The fate of him who, blinded by illusion,
O’erlooks one flaw in love’s enchanted beryl!”

The fictitious character portrayed, having before his mind his inalienable ideal of love, rejects at the final moment of fruition the passion to which he had yielded, because he finds himself on the verge of disloyalty to his supreme nature.

Mr. Symonds is before all things an idealist, and the whole of his poetical work shows that he is never for a moment led into the paths of realism. This quality, even if he possessed no others, would entitle him to profound consideration; for idealism in literature, whether prose or poetry, is the rarest quality found.

The sonnets called “*Among the Mountains*,” and ending the book, are more personal; he lets us see the world of our exile, how he faces his solitude and silence of soul among the pines and the eternal snows, and what his written words have been to him:

“Notes of a mute, not melancholy world,
A world of snows and darkness and moon-sheen,
Of still crystalline air and stars serene,

And stationary pines in slumber furled :
 Notes of the sober night, when drift is whirled
 By tireless winds over the solemn scene,
 When the lake-pavement groans, and mists between
 The shadowy mountain tops are coldly curled :
 Notes of a meditative man who walks
 Those white fields and that ice-floor all alone,
 Yet draws warm life from winter's frozen wells :
 Notes of a soul that most divinely talks
 Unto herself in silence, and hath known
 The God that in the mystic moon-world dwells."

There are many sonnets of great beauty among those collected under the heading of "Juvenilia," two In Memoriam—a theme particularly suited to the restrictions of the sonnet form, and four on classical themes which have many echoes of the Greek lyric writers.

Mr. Woolner's *Silenus* (Macmillan) has many passages of great beauty, but it is on the whole disappointing, as must of necessity be any representation of a Greek myth not wholly simple in its mode of treatment. Mr. Woolner introduces us to Silenus as the youthful demigod who loves and is loved by Syrinx, whom he leaves in order to accompany Duroysoa on one of his expeditions. During his absence, to escape the importunity of Pan she flees for safety to the river, and is changed into the whispering reeds. Silenus, given up to misery on his return, is exhorted by Duroysoa to drown his grief in wine, and sinking lower and lower becomes the gross bacchanal, familiar in art and literature as the constant attendant at the drunken revelries of his master. Then comes to him Athene in a vision, and in one of the finest passages of the book forgives him the sin against his higher nature, because he has loved much :

"Strange is thy fate !
 As our great star, beyond thy sight remote,
 Ring'd by love splendour in the space of worlds,
 Encircled has thy being been with love !
 And as that splendour to the central orb
 It never nears, but moves for ever round,
 Thy passion is to thee !"

What mars the poem as a whole is the projection into it of the modern subjective spirit, so wholly incongruous with the spirit of Greek life.

The purely descriptive passages are full of simple sensuous treatment in keeping with the subject, and in these the feeling for form—no doubt greatly aided by the other side of the author's genius—rejoices us by the distinctly plastic method of representation it gives to the narrative ; and it is the success of these that makes us realise how well we could have spared the moral of the myth. The prophetic and inspired side of *Silenus* is often rendered with considerable fire and poetic beauty, of which the curse on Pan offers a fair example :

"Again Silenus cried, 'Accursèd go,
 Lost in thy solitude, thou never more
 Shalt taste the freshness of the summer wind ;
 Shalt know but hate in ever-burning brain ;

Rage and destruction bearing no delight.
 Thy bitterest disgust, that life's increase
 Surpasses thy persistence to destroy.
 Faithful, unshrinking Death, whose outstretch'd hand,
 Soothing with soft inevitable touch,
 Quenches the agony of humankind,
 Cannot be known by thee."

Miss Robinson's *New Arcadia and other Poems* (Ellis & White) is a distinct advance upon her former work ; it has more vigour and originality, though less perhaps on the whole of the musical qualities of her first volume. Unlike most young writers, Miss Robinson is not full of her own personality, and does not draw upon it for inspiration, and in the present instance her impulse to write has been the sordid misery of those who dwell not in great towns, where people look for degradation, but face to face with nature, where Arcadia formerly was thought to be :

" For I do not sing to enchant you or beguile ;
 I sing to make you think enchantment vile ;
 I sing to wring your hearts, and make you know
 What shame there is in the world—what wrongs, what woe."

And so we get some very forcible narratives, notably in "The Scapegoat," "The Brothers," and "The Cotter's Girl;" which depend for emphasis upon their simple pathos, and are in no wise backed up by any moral application, which would have been a weakness and not a strength. The rest of the book contains some metrical efforts in the form of "Rispetti and Stornelli"—a mystical poem—and some verses on Apprehension, which show what musical lines the author can write when she does not neglect the poetry of her diction.

One portion of it is worthy to be placed among any collection of sonnets of past or living writers :

" O foolish dream, to hope that such as I,
 Who answer only to thine easiest moods,
 Should fill my heart, as o'er my heart there broods
 The perfect fulness of thy memory !
 I flit across thy soul as white birds fly
 Across the untrodden desert solitudes ;
 A moment's flash of wings ; fair interludes
 That leave unchanged the eternal sand and sky—
 E'en such to thee am I ; but thou to me
 As the embracing shore to the sobbing sea,
 E'en as the sea itself to the stone-toss'd rill ;
 But who, but who shall give such rest to thee ?
 The deep mid-ocean waters perpetually
 Call to the land, and call unanswer'd still."

Mr. Andrew Lang's dainty little volume of *Rhymes à la mode* (Kegan Paul) gives us some excellent specimens of society verses in an unusually light and finished manner, such as the "Ballads of a Girton Girl," and "Love's Martyr." But the book also contains one or two more important things, the chief of which is perhaps a rhymed version of a passage in Lucian called "The Fortunate Island."

We must not pass over without mention the Cameos or Sonnets from the antique, which are really translations of well-known classical passages, those from the "Hippolytus" being particularly happy in their reproduction of classic feeling.

The third and last volume of Mr. Boulger's *History of China* (Allen) concludes by far the most important history of that country we possess, which, beginning from the early period of native chroniclers, is brought down to the Kuldja Treaty at St. Petersburg, and the death of the Eastern Empress in 1881.

It is naturally the most interesting volume of all, embracing the period of Chinese foreign relations, while the others are taken up with the record of shifting dynasties, internal politics, and names unfamiliar to all but a student of Oriental history. Reading of the English connection with China in the light of present events between France and the Celestial Empire, we may feel relief at seeing proved by the narrative of events that England had no desire to take advantage of an adversary when in 1834 the Government inherited the trading rights of the East India Company, and was obliged to make a stand against the indignities to which its servants had submitted. Our intercourse with China during the whole of this century clearly proves one thing—the insurmountable exclusiveness of the natives, the anti-foreign feeling in the country, and their unalterable desire to close their markets to us and turn us out of the country. Whether they will ever be so far civilised as to recognise the advantages of international trade on a footing of equality seems doubtful.

We may speak of Ireland in the same terms as the Bible speaks of the poor—it is always with us; but Miss Hickson's book on *Ireland in the Seventeenth Century* (Longmans) takes our attention from present disputes to the Irish massacres of 1641-2. The greater part of the two volumes contains careful extracts from the unpublished depositions relating to the massacres, reports of the trials in 1652, and other papers dealing with the same subject. There is a preface by Mr. Froude, and one important introduction by Miss Hickson, which would make a small volume by itself. The object of the book is to oppose a theory recently sprung up, and supported to some extent by men of such weight as Mr. Lecky and Mr. Gardiner, that there was no organised rising and massacre in 1641, but that it has been "invented by the Puritan English as an excuse for stripping the Irish of their lands."

This view, says Mr. Froude, is being accepted by the Irish at home and abroad, and has helped them to their present attitude.

What follows from such an assumption is very obvious—Cromwell's action and that of the Long Parliament was nothing less than a base and infamous conspiracy. The evidence in support of that action lies in thirty-two volumes of manuscript depositions in Trinity College, Dublin—depositions of witnesses examined between 1641 and 1652, and chiefly by a Parliamentary commission. For some reason or another they have been excluded from the calendared State papers, and the custom has been with Nationalist writers of treating them as absolutely worthless and untrustworthy.

It is this evidence upon which Miss Hickson draws so largely; but as it is impossible for any writer to produce it as a whole, it is under the objection to those who oppose the view it supports of being but a partial publication. One cannot, therefore, be hopeful that the present volumes will be of much effect in influencing public opinion—that opinion, at least, that has been

hitherto untouched by arguments, the conclusiveness of which one would think must appeal to every impartial reader of history.

For, after all, what does the recent theory presuppose? Nothing less than either the manufacture of the thirty-two volumes of depositions, or the conspiracy of many hundreds of witnesses to weave a tissue of lies. Further, as Mr. Froude points out, no writer of the time, Catholic or Protestant, ever denied it; no person of any importance rose up to overthrow the accusations against their countrymen.

Miss Hickson appears to deal very successfully with the cardinal objection to the depositions made by Warner and Gilbert, that they had cancelling lines drawn across them by the writer of them. According to her view these lines are the marks of unimportant abbreviations, which the official copyist to the king was directed to omit.

Under the sensational title of *The Scourge of Christendom* (Smith, Elder, & Co.), Colonel Playfair narrates the British relations with Algiers prior to the French conquest, and from its origin as a piratical state till the abolition of Christian slavery by Lord Exmouth in 1816. The materials for this account have been gleaned from the collection of the correspondence of diplomatic agents and consuls at Algiers, and royal letters from 1600, preserved in the Public Record Office, from the archives of the British Consulate at Algiers, which do not go further back than 824, and from those of other nations, more especially of the United States. The whole is told in some three hundred pages, and is a very simple and interesting record of "the famous and warlike city of Algiers."

Mr. Harrop has written a very interesting monograph on *Bolingbroke* (Kegan Paul), which in the reasonable compass of one volume will be accepted gratefully by the general reader whom the recent elaborate method of dealing with periods of history often deters from the study of history at all.

It is not perhaps altogether strange that, hitherto, the brilliant statesman of the reign of Anne, the orator and writer of admirable prose, the friend of Pope and Dryden and the wits of the Augustan age of literature, should have been better understood and more impartially written upon abroad than at home. For it is not easy for a Whig writer to forget that he was the most striking Tory of the reign, nor for a Tory writer to forgive him for ruining the cause by his desertion to the Pretender, nor for the Churchman to overlook his deliberately worldly views. And so it happens that we have to go to a Frenchman, M. Ch. de Rémusat, for a thoroughly impartial account of his life and views; and to a German, Herr Brosch, for an elaborate and exhaustive study, based on the reports in the Venetian archives, made by the ambassadors of Venice, who were watching minutely the state of affairs in England at the time for the purpose of transferring the information to their own court.

Compared to such works Mr. Harrop's is of course not so significant, but he gives a careful summary, which will be exceedingly useful to such as do not care to enter on those foreign works above mentioned.

The success of Mr. Justin McCarthy's former historical work, a *History of Our Own Times*, may have induced him to place the *History of the Four Georges* (Chatto & Windus) before the public. We do not, however, anticipate for it the popularity of its predecessors.

Mr. McCarthy writes as smoothly and pleasantly as ever, and he gives us a succession of succinctly written biographies of the principal public men of the time, which add greatly to the interest of the volume; but the period of

George I.'s reign is not an interesting chapter of English history, and as the book is written too slightly, and without the necessary details which would make it of any value to the historical student, it will not improbably fail to secure a lasting popularity.

Colonel Malleon deals with the principal military events of the Thirty Years' War in the *Battle-fields of Germany* (Allen), beginning with Breitenfeld and ending with Blenheim. The subject is not dealt with from the political nor exclusively from the military point of view, and Colonel Malleon is especially happy in knowing what to leave out in order to attain his object, which is to resuscitate the battle-fields from the oblivion into which they have fallen, and to emphasise the events that led to them.

He also brings into relief the career and personality of the most prominent figures that engaged in the struggles, thus giving a definiteness and individual interest to the separate narratives. With the exception of Fehrbellin, he visited all the battle-fields treated of, and the keenness and vivacity of his style show that it has been a labour of love.

He also writes the life of Marshal Loudon, the second of the series of *Military Biographies* which has been started by Messrs. Chapman & Hall, Frederick the Great being dealt with by Colonel Brackenbury. The series is designed to form a set of critical biographies, illustrative of the operations and art of war, and will be confined only to those who are distinguished in the profession. Its aim is both popular and scientific, and maps accompany the two volumes already issued, which present the opposing aspects of the Seven Years' War. It is doubtful whether it is possible to make such a subject both scientific and popular, and a definite tendency in either one or the other direction would be most likely to meet with success.

Travellers will welcome with gladness a new edition of Mr. Hare's deservedly popular *Cities of Northern and Central Italy* (Smith, Elder, & Co.) Most of the places have been revisited in order to bring the art and other information up to date; and the sketches, with few exceptions taken on the spot by the author, together with his well-known habit of illustration by quotation, give much liveliness to the information of travel and history. The difference in the mode of travelling to-day from that which formerly prevailed has necessitated such a revision, and Mr. Hare does well, in face of the extreme facilities for rapid locomotion, to implore his readers not to hurry through the towns, nor make a point of sight-seeing every day.

To many also the remarks on the spirit of suspicion and intolerance of differences of custom and habit with which the English tourist sets forth on Italian travel will not be useless, and many years of sojourn in the towns and country enable the writer to speak with authority as regards the real character of the natives. The literature of Italian travel is wonderfully limited in quality, and those who know this from experience will not be likely to under-estimate these volumes.

Miss Horner and her sister have likewise entirely recast their *Walks in Florence and its Environs* (Smith, Elder, & Co.), which all who sojourn in Florence will do well to take with them in their wanderings, together with "Romola" and "Pascarel," two very different works, but each in their way full of local colour, and extremely vivid in the impressions they leave behind.

The illustrations do not greatly add to the value of the work, nor are they wanted in a book of the kind unless, like Mr. Hare's, they are really

part of the letterpress, to which they may be said to add an emphasis of commentary. The authors seem occasionally to be overcome by the amount of detail, historical and descriptive, which they introduce from fear of leaving out anything important; but those whose stay in Florence is a prolonged one will not quarrel with this feature, and in a local history excess of detail is more excusable than in a general account of travel.

The Region of Eternal Fire (Allen) is the name of Mr. Charles Marvin's last book of travels. He is a most indefatigable writer of large volumes, and the present one is not behind the others in interest. It gives a full account of the petroleum regions in the Caspian, and there is also much about the relations of Russia and England in the East. Mr. Marvin was for some years special correspondent of the *Morning Post* in the region of the Caspian, and for that reason, and his constant labour on the Central Asian Question, seen from his other books, has a real claim on the attention of all interested in the subject.

A Land March from England to Ceylon forty years ago (Allen), by Mr. Mitford, is chiefly interesting as showing what travelling in the East was like in the Palmerstonian era, when railways and telegraphs and photography were unknown. The contents of the book were written in letters home, and though they include many small details only of interest under those circumstances, it was well to retain the character of the narrative rather than re-organise them into a more formal book of travel. Nearly 10,000 miles of country, of which 7,000 were on horseback, were traversed by Mr. Mitford in his passage through Dalmatia, Montenegro, Turkey, Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, Assyria, Persia, Afghanistan, Scinde, and India, and it took him thirty-four months to reach Colombo, his furthest point.

This is enough to show what endurance was necessary in those days when luxury in travel was unknown, and the difficulties of the route were enough to satisfy any one in search of adventure. Had the writer not had pluck, prudence, and a certain facility for acquiring Oriental languages, he would never have come successfully to his journey's end. The sixty pages devoted to Persia will be found of particular interest, for we hear less of that than of any other Eastern country of similar importance; but Mr. Mitford apparently did not see the side either of the country or its natives that has fascinated more recent travellers. Of the first he says, "Although the weary traveller often finds spots of surpassing fertility and beauty, the country in general is dreary, ungrateful, and barren." Of the second, their lies and general untrustworthiness appear to be the only characteristic that struck him.

Mr. Crawford gives a short account of a journey across the continent of South America in **Across the Pampas and the Andes** (Longmans), an expedition he made as engineer-in-chief of a staff of engineers sent out in agreement with the Government of Buenos Ayres to survey the route for the proposed Transandine Railway. In his residence there during two periods of three years each, in charge of various public works, he gained an intimate knowledge of the country and of the railways, out of which he makes a simple and unpretentious narrative. The appendix contains some valuable information on the peaks and passes of the Andes, and on the Argentine Republic.

Miss Potter republishes from "Blackwood's Magazine" **A Lady's Ride across Spanish Honduras** (Blackwood), and Mr. Horatio Brown makes an interesting volume of chat about Venice in **Life on the Lagoons** (Kegan Paul).

Miss Gordon Cumming, who is perhaps the most persistent writer of travels we have in the regularity with which she contributes biennially to the subject, writes well on Oriental life in **In the Himalayas and on the Indian Plains** (Chatto & Windus).

We always wonder why books of travel are invariably got up in the most bulky and expensive style, and partake so much, as regards their appearance, of the nature of "drawing-room" or "gift" books. Such is the case with Lady Brassey's spirited account of her last voyage in the *Sunbeam*, which she calls **In the Trades, the Tropics, and the 'Roaring Forties'** (Longmans), and during which she visited Madeira, Trinidad, Venezuela, Jamaica, the Bahamas, the Bermudas, and the Azores. Lady Brassey has the knack of very lively narrative, and her volume, though it requires a rest to support its burden in one sense, is most light and entertaining in every other; and the illustrations, which are very numerous and excellent, are incorporated with the letterpress, so that the running commentary of the artist ingeniously supplements that of the author.

The Maritime Alps and their Seaboard, by the author of "*Vera*" (Longmans), is likewise a well-got-up volume, giving much pleasant information, historical and general, about the well-worn track of invalids in the south of France.

Cannes, Mentone, Grasse, Nice, and Monaco are written of from very intimate personal knowledge, and those who know the author's stories will not be surprised at finding the chapters on the people, the farmers, and the whole agricultural and rural life of Provence among the best in the book. Picturesque writing on a subject of this kind, when it is not overdone, has an admirable charm. The illustrations are not up to the level of the rest of the book.

The theological literature of the year has not been of an important character, though there has been the usual issue of devotional works.

The eight Bampton lectures for 1882 have been published by the Rev. Peter Goldsmith Medd, under the title of **The One Mediator** (Rivingtons), their object being to exhibit in outline the twofold mediatorial character which belongs to the Son of God as the sole means where-through the *ad extra* action of the Godhead has ever proceeded.

The Rev. W. A. Bartlett writes on **The Profitableness of the Old Testament Scriptures** (Rivingtons) in a treatise founded on 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

The Footprints of the Son of Man (Rivingtons), by Canon Luckock, are addresses delivered in Ely Cathedral on week days, and are introduced by the Bishop of Ely in a preface, in which he says that he has advised their publication, as likely to supply a want in the private study of Holy Scripture, and that of the parochial clergy in their regular instruction of Biblical subjects.

Mr. Wilfrid Ward's **Wish to Believe** (Kegan Paul) has appeared in part in the "Nineteenth Century," but there is much new matter added in the present volume. It is a dialogue in which the earnest desire for a religious faith is shown to be really the most favourable attitude for arriving at truth, and not, as is generally stated, a drawback to the reliability of the judgment.

The following are of minor importance, but are fairly representative of the issues of the press on the various subjects of which they treat.

Old-World Questions and New-World Answers (Kegan Paul), by

Mr. Daniel Pidgeon, is, as its name suggests, an account of how America has solved the difficult problems of labour and government, which at present occupy us so largely. "The American," says the author in his preface, "is a social alchemist. Democracy is his solvent, the common school his crystallising agent, and intelligent freedom the shining product which he seeks in his laboratory." The temperance town of Winsted, the factory system, the school organisations, the great industries of millinery and clock-making, the Shaker and other communistic establishments, are dealt with in a series of chapters, that form very pleasant reading, because written from personal observations, made without effort. The style of these essays—for such they are, each chapter being devoted to a particular subject—is light and clear, and, without being overloaded with information, gives an excellent picture of the means by which American character and industry have overcome difficulties of which our country, with all its accumulated experience, seems as far off the solution as ever. The account of local government in the chapter on Common Schools shows a republican institution in its best light.

At Home in Paris (Allen) is the name given to two volumes by the late Mr. Blanchard Jerrold, the first of which deals with almsgiving in France, and was part of a much larger scheme, never carried out by the author, of an inquiry into the European systems of poor relief. Now that the study of the London poor occupies the minds and efforts of so many, an account of the public and private institutions of France, conducted as they are on an altogether different method, will be received with satisfaction. There is no subject on which opinion differs so much as on the treatment of the poor; and until some harmony can be arrived at, remedies for abuses will not be forthcoming. Materials for arriving at a common point of view are best obtained by a methodical presentation of the treatment pursued in other countries; and we may hope that the time is not far distant when official support will be given to an exhaustive inquiry into the European systems of poor relief and Continental charities. The chapters on the Beggars' Château of Villers-Cotterets, or final asylum of paupers—not vagrants, and the St. Denis Dépôt, show the fundamental distinction drawn by the French law between the poor man and the beggar; and the description of the former will make most of us ashamed of the characteristics of our English poor-house.

The second volume contains some literary estimates of the fall of the Second Empire, rather happily summed up under the title of the Gavroche Party; but we do not think that either these or the observations of M. Chose, in which the humour is of a very poor order, deserved rescuing from oblivion.

The South Kensington Museum Art Handbooks (Chapman & Hall) are very good and satisfactory within the limits necessitated by their object. "English Earthenware," a handbook to the wares made in England during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as illustrated by specimens in the national collections, is done by Professor Church, and is full of excellent woodcuts from objects not only in the South Kensington Museum, but in other public collections.

French Pottery is treated by MM. Paul Garnault and Edouard Garnier, and is illustrated from the collections in South Kensington alone, the drawings and marks in this, and indeed throughout the series, being very good, and representative of the materials they portray.

Russian Art, by Alfred Maskell, is wider in its scope than the last handbook, and "is intended not only as a guide to the special collection of reproductions now in the South Kensington Museum, but to supply some information also respecting the chief among the art treasures which are preserved in the imperial palaces, the churches, and the monasteries of Russia." There is a chapter devoted to each of the great collections of St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kertch, and Siberia, and a particularly interesting one on religious art in Russia. Considering how little is known in this country of the possessions of Russia, this book will be most welcome to all who desire to study their connection with European art.

Mr. Charles Eastlake continues his notes on the principal pictures in foreign galleries, the latest instalment being the **Old Pinakothek at Munich** (Longmans), the publication of which has been postponed until the issue of the new official catalogue, consequent on the re-numbering and rearranging of the pictures in that gallery. The book is up to date, not only regarding the numbers and position of the works, but also with reference to the data and most recent criticism of many of the pictures.

Miss Croft's **Chapters in the History of English Literature** from 1509 to the close of the Elizabethan period (Rivingtons), notwithstanding its modest title, is an excellent manual for students of the period with which it deals. With the exception of the late Mr. Clark's "English Language and Literature," and Professor Morley's "Manual of English Literature," students have had no guide-book on which they could depend for sound criticism and a comprehensive survey of the tendencies of periods. In the latter respect even the above-mentioned are strikingly deficient.

The fault of the present book is that the author does not depend sufficiently upon her own judgment, and reproduces, though with great aptness and discrimination, the opinions of accredited teachers and critics. This is the more to be regretted as her own criticism, where she allows it prominence, is particularly suggestive and felicitous. The book is founded on lectures given at Newnham College, and its origin is apparent in several chapters which are wanting in unity; but others, such as the Introduction, on the Renaissance in Italy, and some on the dramatists, are complete and important studies.

We cannot think that the Hon. A. S. E. Canning's **Hints on Shakspeare** (Allen) fulfil a want or are a worthy addition to Shakespearian literature. Nowadays that literature has to be of a high order to justify its appearance. It must throw some new light of external evidence on the disputed matter of the plays, or it must give by original or exceptionally well expressed criticism a keener impression of their literary power.

Unfortunately there is nothing of either kind in the present volume; of criticism there is none. A specimen of what passes for such is to be found in the opening chapter on "Julius Cæsar," and is a fair sample of the rest of the work:—"Modern readers may surely regret that Cæsar was not made more prominent. He might, in Shakspeare's hands, have made most interesting and instructive allusions to his foreign conquests and campaigns, especially in Britain, but in the play he is exclusively occupied with the conflicting passions and feelings of his fellow-Romans."

Each chapter commences with a sketch of the play; the rest of it is taken up with an extension of this in a detailed narrative account, the prose of which is an echo of Lamb's tales from Shakespeare, without its simple grace and suitability to children.

Haunted Homes (Allen) is a new series of the ghost stories and family traditions which belong to many well-known dwellings of Great Britain, compiled by Mr. Ingram as a guide to the topography of ghostland. The Psychical Society will no doubt owe the editor many thanks, who does not seem to have met with the difficulties which the section of the Society on Haunted Houses speak of as almost insuperable to their presentation of facts to the public.

From the numerous stories contained in this book we may infer that information has been readily forthcoming.

The Rev. J. G. Wood, so well known to all boys and girls as the best companion for the insect-hunter, has published a new edition of the collection of anecdotes called **Petland Revisited** (Longmans), in which not only are cats and dogs the heroes, but chameleons and hedgehogs, snakes, toads, and frogs, and an animal new to most, called the coaiti-mondi, figure as agreeable companions. The book is most attractively got up, and the drawings of the pets, conventional and unconventional, full of spirit and character.

The Sagacity and Morality of Plants, by Mr. J. E. Taylor (Chatto & Windus), is, as its name implies, an attempt to make vivid the laws that govern the life of plants by treating them as if they were conscious beings with a system of ethics. This hardly appears a sound way of treating a scientific subject, though many may think it the natural outcome of the Darwinian system.

Without following Mr. Taylor into the metaphysics of consciousness with which he excuses his title, we may say that his book amply justifies its intention of rendering plants and flowers more interesting to people who have read it than they were before.

The Sea Fisherman, by J. C. Wilcocks (Longmans), has reached its fourth edition, and this has no doubt been hastened by the stimulus given to interest in the subject through the Fisheries Exhibition. The chief methods of hook and line fishing in the British and other seas are treated exhaustively, and the remarks on nets, boats, and boating are profusely illustrated with woodcuts, the practical fisherman getting ample information on every conceivable topic connected with his art. The fishing stations are described, with whiffing, trawling, and the practices on each coast, the minutiae of gear and tackle being given with detailed instruction, and the characteristics and habits of the various fish described. So complete a little work must inevitably prove the companion of all who go down to the sea in ships for purposes of fishing.

The Health of the Senses (Longmans), by Dr. Maonaughten Jones, is a popular little treatise on sight, hearing, voice, &c., full of useful hints on the care of the organs connected with the senses, and meant for the guidance of those who have little or no knowledge of physiology. The introductory chapter, on the effects of habits on the health generally, and of the growing importance of preventive rather than curative medical science, is full of a common sense that there is much need of impressing on the public mind. The responsibility of the Church in the matter of public health, too, is dealt with in a few temperately written pages. The book is illustrated with all necessary diagrams of the organs themselves, and of all apparatus connected with their simple treatment in disease.

The second edition of the **Catholic Dictionary**, by Addis and Arnold (Kegan Paul), following so quickly on the first, shows that the authors

were not mistaken in the desire felt by the Catholic public for a trustworthy source of information as to the doctrine, ritual, and discipline of their religion. "Our doctrines, rites, and history," says Cardinal Newman, in his approbation of the undertaking, "have been at the mercy of Protestant manuals, which, however ably written, and even when fair in intention, are not such as a Catholic can approve or recommend." We are not aware, as the preface says, that "it is impossible to turn over ten pages of any English work of a similar character without meeting with some more or less of open attack on Catholicism;" still, it is no doubt important to the community that such a work should receive the authority of the Church before being universally accepted. The dictionary will be as welcome to Protestants as to Catholics, for the greatest ignorance prevails among us concerning subjects connected with the Catholic Church; and such a ready book of reference, in which the matter is arranged alphabetically, and the articles are brief and compact, will be of universal use.

Our old friend Dr. Brewer, author of the "Guide to Science" of our childhood, has published a **Dictionary of Miracles** (Chatto & Windus), in three parts, dealing with the miracles of saints in imitation of Scripture miracles, realistic miracles, and miracles to prove Church dogmas, respectively. Its object is to show without comment a mode of religious thought which prevailed in Christendom for many centuries, and has not wholly died out seemingly, by accumulation of data and inferences deducible therefrom, but the result is not a satisfactory piece of book-making.

Mr. Ashton, who prefers the bypaths to the highways of literature, has followed up his studies of the reign of Queen Anne by researches into the **English Caricature and Satire on Napoleon I.** (Chatto & Windus). Napoleon's life is taken from its commencement, and as much history is given as is necessary to explain the caricatures. These of course are mostly humorous, but lose considerably by their reduction to a small size. They are well reproduced for the most part, and the two volumes contain plenty of amusement.

Mr. Hawkins's **Annals of the French Stage**, from its origin to the death of Racine (Chapman & Hall), is a disappointing book. First of all he had a fair field, and so was exceptionally fortunate in his selection of a subject; secondly, he had the fifteen volumes of the "*Histoire du Théâtre Français*," by the brothers Parfaict, as a mine of wealth from which to extract his ore. Of course, he has drawn largely from this and other French sources, but why is that most interesting development of the French stage—the mediæval drama—disposed of in a single chapter? The miracle and mystery plays are barely mentioned; the old farces and "soties" are passed over with a casual reference, the whole period between 1552 and 1629 being relegated to a few pages. From Corneille to Racine—a period of seventy years—on the other hand, we get every detail, the pieces brought out every year, the lives of the authors and actors—in fact, a whole *catalogue raisonné* of theatrical proceedings. But we cannot forgive the author for expending so much space on a comparatively uninteresting part of the history of the French stage, and neglecting the period by far the most fruitful in historic interest. His account is really one of the modern stage, and as such the title is misleading.

The additions to the **Parchment Library Series** (Kegan Paul) have been "English Sacred Lyrics," by the editor, Mr. Paul, and a capital selection by Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole, from Swift's writings, preceded by an

introduction, an excellent piece of writing, both showing that the task of extract has fallen into the best hands.

Lectures on the Industrial Revolution in England (Rivingtons) contains the record of some of the work done by the late Mr. Toynbee, of Oxford, in his effort to help the progress of the working classes. They are introduced by a memoir from Professor Jowett, full of appreciative sympathy for the young man who was cut off so early in the midst of his social efforts. The subjects are for the most part economic—Ricardo and the Old Political Economy, the Growth of Pauperism, Population, and the Condition of the Wage Earners being among the number; his endeavours after a new political economy being suggested to him while teaching the subject to the Indian civilians at Balliol. He considered that the days of the science as an abstract one were over, and that it was misleading to deal with hypotheses which are more often than not set aside by facts. But in his attempts to correct the extreme abstraction of the science, his tendency was to forget that the laws so often misapplied are never altogether done away with. He lived a part of the year, for many years, at White-chapel, studying the condition of the working classes, and it is not surprising that he was chiefly impressed with the fact that the labouring man is not really free to contract with his master from social inequality; that though the accumulation of wealth is eagerly prosecuted, its distribution is wholly neglected, so that the labourer has little chance of gaining a proportionate share of any increase of industry that may take place. "The other subject in which he took an active interest was the reform of the Established Church; and the necessary changes he conceived to be the abolition of subscription, and the admission of the laity to the government of the Church." The volume closes with a few notes on this matter.

It would appear as if writing of any importance, either in matter or manner, became more and more confined to science and subjects of technical interest generally. They absorb, apparently, the intellectual vitality of the writing world with very few exceptions; so that, although general literature is as extensive as ever, its quality seems to deteriorate year by year. And if we except memoirs and biographies, which, from their number and importance, are here treated separately, it is difficult to make a selection of works worthy of mention that belong to the department of literature pure and simple. An increasing portion of nondescript literature consists of reprints of articles contributed to the ever-growing number of magazines and reviews; and from the nature of their origin such work, when re-issued, fails in unity, and is generally ephemeral in character.

The literature of leisure, if one may venture to call it so, which delighted the public in such papers as Lamb's, and such essays as De Quincey's, seems altogether to have disappeared; and in their stead we get the boiling down of the monthlies, controversial papers collected when their explanatory cause has been forgotten or pushed aside, and a great deal of very second-rate criticism on writers whose fame and position in history has been long ago assigned once and for all.

But there are some exceptions to this general expression of decadence.

Mr. Lang's unpretentious book on **Custom and Myth** (Longmans) is a very interesting one. Its object is a protest against the prevalent method of comparative mythology, which takes the analysis of proper names in myths as a key to the meaning of the story. Now this philological mode of dealing with a myth is obviously open to the objection that scholars are

often in fundamental opposition to each other as to the original root from which a name springs, and that thus the analysis of causes gives the most widely different results. In the introductory essay on the method of "Folk-lore," Mr. Lang explains the system he adopts; and the essays on "Cupid and Psyche," "Star Myths," "Apollo and the Mouse," &c., show a methodical attempt to vindicate what he calls the anthropological interpretation of myths. Its leading idea is that mythology cannot be studied apart from folk-lore; and that the way, as in the latter science, to explain apparently irrational and anomalous customs of civilised races, is to compare them with similar customs and manners which exist among the uncivilised and still retain their meaning, there being no necessity that the civilised and uncivilised should be of the same stock, or should have come into contact with each other, since human nature everywhere has resemblances, and similar conditions of mind produce similar practices. So with regard to mythology. While scientific mythologists will only compare the myths of races which speak languages of the same family, or of races which have been in forced contact with each other, the method of folk-lore compares myths of the most widely severed races. "Holding that myth is a product of the early human fancy, working on the most rudimentary knowledge of the outer world, the student of folk-lore thinks that differences of race do not much affect the early mythopœic faculty." In the following essays the method is to place the usage or myth which is unintelligible when found among a civilised race, beside the similar myth which is intelligible enough when it is found among savages. The hypothesis will be that the myth or usage is common to both races, not because of original community of stock, not because of contact or borrowing, but because the ancestors of the Greeks, in a particular case, passed through the savage intellectual condition in which we find the Australians. Thus the mouse, as the attribute of Apollo, is explained from a study of Peruvian custom, and is traced to the habit in prehistoric times of claiming descent from a natural object—is, in fact, an example of religious evolution.

Mr. Lang runs foul of Mr. Max Müller as the representative of the philological method, especially in the essay on "Fetichism and the Infinite," in which that great scholar's conception of the savage apprehension of the infinite is treated with considerable humour; but the controversial element in the book is never aggressive, and conflicting views meet with every respect.

Euphorien (Fisher Unwin) is the title taken by Vernon Lee for her studies of the antique and the mediæval in the Renaissance.

Euphorien is Goethe's name for the child born of the marriage of Faust and Helen; and so the Renaissance, as the outcome of the spirit of antiquity in union with the middle ages, seems to be personified in this offspring of parents so heterogeneous in character.

The best essays in the first volume are "The Italy of Elizabethan Dramatists," and "The Outdoor Poetry of the Same Period." England, on awaking from her long sleep, sought the material for intellectual activity in Italy; Englishmen flocked thither, to return "laden with an immense, uncouth burden of jewels and broken wealth and refuse and ordure, with pseudo-antique philosophy, with half-mediæval Dantesque and Petrarchesque poetry, with Renaissance science, with humanistic pedantry and obscenity, with euphemistic conceits and casuistic quibbles, with art, politics, metaphysics,

civilisation, embedded in all manner of rubbish and abomination." All this alloy, before it was melted in the Shakespearian crucible, was the property of Webster, and Ford, and Massinger, Tourneur, Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher. But this Italy as mirrored for us in Elizabethan drama, with its horrible tragedy, strange crimes, and awfulness of every kind, is wholly unrepresented both in Italian art and Italian literature of the period. "Where, in this Renaissance of Italian literature, so cheerful and light of conscience, is the foul and savage Renaissance of English tragedy? Does the art of Italy tell an impossible, a universal lie? or is the art of England the victim of an impossible, universal hallucination?"

Vernon Lee's answer to this problem is interesting and original. There was no moral struggle in the Italy of that time; simply sublime indifference to good and evil, passivity to surrounding influences, whether bad or good, which resulted in her great men combining high qualities with stupendous crimes, being distinguished for love of art and literature and noble compositions, as well as for unspeakable wickedness of every kind. "So the Italians, steeped in the sin of their country, remained intellectually healthy and serene; while the English, coming from a purer moral atmosphere, were seized with strange moral sickness of horror at what they had seen and could not forget; and the sin of the Renaissance, which the art of Italy could neither portray nor perceive, appeared on the stage decked in superb and awful garb by the tragic imagination of Elizabethan England."

The most important essays in the second volume of "Euphron" are those on Mediæval Love and the Portrait Art of the Renaissance. The text of the first is Dante's "Vita Nuova," which taught the lesson of spirituality in love to an age in which for generations it had been based on authorised adultery. Love was purified through an intensifying of the ideal element at a time when it wanted cleansing from impurity by chivalry, fidelity, and adoration.

Mrs. Mitchell's book on *Ancient Sculpture* (Kegan Paul) is interesting from several points of view.

First of all it is the work of an American, and as such shows that the nation possesses some who make up for a want of historical antiquity, and of ancient art monuments in their surroundings, by a most patient appreciation of what the older world has achieved in matters of scholarly criticism, as well as in the more material results of exploration.

It is also a mark of the rapid advance of that latest science, archaeology, which, though sprung into being so recently, has made such rapid strides, that, within the last few years, each year has brought with it the issue of some important history of ancient art. Mrs. Mitchell has pursued the historical method in treating her subject; and the first part of her book is taken up with a sufficient account of Egyptian, Assyrian, and Phœnician art to enable the student to realise by means of this comparative method that Hellenic art did not commence with Hellas herself, but that Eastern influence had a large share in its genealogy. "Since, in treating of works of art," says Mrs. Mitchell, "description cannot by any possibility supersede the sight of the artistic creations themselves, a strenuous effort has been made to secure suitable illustrations;" and this effort has had as a result that no work of art of any importance has been left without representation, and the reproductions are quite up to the standard attainable in a work that was to be at all within the compass of students. It is a mistake, however, not to have named the

book a history of Greek sculpture instead of its present title, as the introductory sketch of ancient art, though adequate for its purpose, is not sufficient to warrant its consideration as a history of ancient art. Mrs. Mitchell's notes and references testify to the patience and conscientiousness with which she has studied the German archaeologists; her index of citations from Greek and Latin authors shows that she has verified all that the ancients had to say on their great works of art; while the tables of museums where the originals are to be found, with their approximate age, is a most valuable addition to what is in every way an important text-book.

The most recent development of education having substantiated that its object is the training of faculty rather than the acquisition of knowledge, such a book as Mr. Sully's *Outlines of Psychology* (Longmans) supplies a very practical need, for it treats of psychology with special reference to the science of education. It is an elementary book, demanding little or no previous knowledge of the subject, and providing ample definition of technical terms. Mr. Sully claims for psychology the position of a positive science, marked off from the natural sciences, though susceptible like them of being brought under definite laws, and having its own method of introspection, which he considers capable of being employed as a scientific instrument. But while thus following the traditions of Mr. Bain and the Scotch school generally, he adopts the more modern habit of supplementing the psychological study of mind by the physiological study of its nervous conditions.

No doubt the general reader will be most interested in those sections—such as memory, attention, and imagination—which connect education with the examination of faculty, and supply a basis on which to carry on intelligently the different branches of training. Of the manner in which these are treated it suffices to say that the clearness and simplicity of style, and the separation by print and paragraph of the more abstruse matter, bring the book within the unaided understanding of any one interested in the subject.

The volume on *Europe*, the last of Mr. Stanford's important "Compendiums of Geography and Travel," has made its appearance. Based on Von Hellwald's well-known work "Die Erde und ihre Völker," it has, like the other volumes of the series, been remodelled and worked up to suit requirements which a translation of the original work would not have met. Mr. Rudler and Mr. Chisholm have carried out the execution of this volume under the direction of Sir A. C. Ramsay, and it is in many ways the most important of the series.

As regards its original parts, the physical section has been re-written; but the second part of the book, descriptive of the political and social condition of the several European States, has not been so much modified from the German work.

Professor Keane has contributed a valuable essay on "European Ethnology and Philology," in the shape of an appendix.

The maps are numerous and excellent; while the illustrations, we think, might have been omitted from the series, as they do not enhance its value or importance in any way, though they are much better in this volume than in some of the preceding ones. Altogether, Mr. Stanford may be congratulated on having brought successfully to a close a work for which there was a great demand, and one which, in the facility of arrangement and thorough dependence to be put upon its information, is likely steadily to increase in public estimation.

ART, DRAMA, AND MUSIC.

I. THE FINE ARTS.

The National Gallery.—The question of purchase of the Blenheim pictures attracted considerable attention during the year. The first intimation that the historic gallery was to be broken up arrived from Berlin in the form of a telegram stating that the National Museum of the German capital had offered two millions of marks for the collection. After many contradictory statements, it was announced officially that in any case the English Government would have the first offer. A committee subsequently appointed recommended the purchase of twelve pictures, for which the Duke of Marlborough's agents asked 400,000*l.* Negotiations thereupon commenced, and were protracted for many months, and in the end the Government consented to purchase the *Ansidei Raphael* for 70,000*l.*, and an equestrian portrait of Charles I. by Vandyck for 15,000*l.* A special grant would, it was announced, be asked from Parliament, but the ratification of the public was certain from the very outset.

Out of the ordinary annual grant for the purchase of pictures, 6,500*l.* (exclusive of 1,700*l.*, part of the Wheeler bequest), the Director of the National Gallery was able to secure some valuable additions. Of these the most important were—(1) English School: Hogarth's "*Shrimp Girl*," and his "*Portrait of Polly Peachem*" (Miss Fenton); W. Blake's "*Procession from Calvary*;" Stothard's "*Canterbury Pilgrims*;" G. Arnold's "*On the Yorkshire Ouse*;" and James Ward's "*Harlech Castle*." (2) Foreign Schools: An Assumption, by Matteo di Giovanni; a Crucifixion, by Antonello da Messina; and a fine landscape by Gaspar Poussin, "*The Calling of Abraham*."

The British Museum.—The space hitherto occupied by the Natural History collections was still further utilised during the year. Two rooms were devoted to an exhibition of reproductions of drawings (autotypes) by the old masters, especially those of Raphael, Michael Angelo, Leonardo da Vinci, &c. Coins, medals, bronzes, terra-cottas, were displayed in ever-increasing numbers; whilst the various departments of Antiquities, Egyptian as well as Greek and Roman, were made more accessible to the public.

The chief additions to the Museum have been in the Print Room, which included a set of 154 portraits of the Roman Emperors, by G. B. de Cavalleris; and a number of drawings by artists of the English school, including Sir James Thornhill's sketch-book, Sir Peter Lely's crayon portrait of Waller the poet, and a number of portraits in sepia, Indian ink, &c., by John Downman.

To the Manuscript department the dispersal of the Ashburnham collection brought the separate series known as the Howe Manuscripts, purchased for 45,000*l.* Of these, those relating to Ireland were, as arranged, transferred to the library of the Royal Irish Academy at Dublin.

South Kensington Museum.—The most important addition to this building during the year was the Museum of Casts, which was thrown open

to the public in spite of its incomplete condition. It contained, however, the reproduction of many classical works but little known in this country, including the first allowed to be taken of the Venus of the Vatican.

The principal acquisitions of the year were the Fortnum-Castellani collection of jewellery, &c. (10,600*l.*), portions of which were distributed between Edinburgh and Dublin. The Turchi collection of ancient glass (280*l.*); a miscellaneous collection of art objects belonging to G. de St. Maurice (1,000*l.*); a Græco-Bactrian armlet (1,000*l.*); the Giustiani ancient gateway (600*l.*); two silver parcel-gilt salt-cellars from Miss G. Rickard (125*l.*); a Tempera drawing (367*l.*); a marble bath (200*l.*); a large Persian carpet from M. Boucicault (380*l.*); and the Reliquary of St. Lachteen from the Fountaine collection (600*l.*).

National Portrait Gallery.—In spite of the insignificant sum (750*l.*) allowed for the purchase of pictures, some very important additions were made to the collection—nineteen by donation from private persons, fifteen from the National Gallery, and seven by purchase. The portraits thus added included those of Her Majesty (after Van Angeli), General Wolfe, William Pitt, the first Duke of Buckingham, Mrs. Siddons, W. M. Thackeray, Richardson, Addison, Sarah Duchess of Marlborough, &c.

A new edition of the catalogue, with a complete analysis and description of the works, was issued during the year; and its author, Mr. George Scharf, the keeper of the museum since its origin, received the well-merited distinction of the Companionship of the Bath.

The **Exhibitions of Pictures** held during the year were more numerous than ever. Amongst them the most important were held at Burlington House.

The **Winter Exhibition of Pictures of the Old Masters** included a special collection of twenty-seven works by Paul Falconer Poole, R.A. There were also among the works of deceased English artists Romney's "Mrs. Jordan;" Gainsborough's "Canning" (as a young man); "Nancy Parsons," and "Mrs. Douglas;" twenty-five works by Sir Joshua Reynolds, including Mrs. Sheridan as St. Cecilia, Lady Sarah Bunbury, Mrs. Backhurst, &c. The foreign pictures were strong, especially in the works of the Flemish and Dutch masters.

The summer exhibition (116th) of the **Royal Academy** comprised nearly two thousand works, and its chief novelty was the increased accommodation accorded to sculpture, in which the principal honours were carried off by Mr. Hamo Thornycroft's "Mower," Mr. Gilbert's "Icarus," Mr. Natorp's "Hercules," and a relief by H. Bates, "Socrates Teaching."

Amongst the oil paintings the most noteworthy were the President's (Sir F. Leighton) Cymon and Iphigenia; Mr. W. Q. Orchardson's "Mariage de Convenience;" Mr. Frank Holl's full length portrait of the Prince of Wales; Mr. Alma Tadema's Hadrian in England, a study of the old British potteries in Kent; Mr. Millais's portrait of Henry Irving; Van Haanen's "Afternoon Coffee;" Fildes's "Venetian Life;" Seymour Lucas's "After Culloden;" R. W. Macbeth's "Fen Farm;" Brett's "Grantont Pier;" P. W. Steer's "Fantaisie;" and "My Love has gone a-sailing," by David Murray. The last-named work, together with Mr. Pettie's "Vigil" and Mr. S. Lucas's "Rebel Hunting," were purchased out of the Chantry Bequest. The purchase of the former, however, gave rise to a good deal of dissatisfaction, which found a voice in Parliament, where the matter was brought forward by Sir Robert Peel, who gave notice of his intention of inviting the attention of the

House of Commons to the condition of the Royal Academy, as an institution no longer exercising a guiding influence for the development of fine art, and having neglected to carry out the reform recommended by the Royal Commission of 1863.

Grosvenor Gallery.—The summer exhibition, although possibly not equal in general interest to some of its predecessors, contained a number of interesting works. Amongst them were two portraits by Mr. Millais of the same lady, Miss Nina Lehmann—one taken in her childhood and exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1870, and the other, now seen for the first time, on the very eve of the lady's marriage. Mr. Burne Jones' "King Cophetua's Daughter" was, however, the principal attraction—the maiden still clad in her lovely garb seated on the golden throne, with the prince, bare-headed but in marvellous damascened armour, seated at her feet. Amongst the other noteworthy works were portraits by Mr. Alma Tadema of Signor Amendola, a distinguished sculptor, and of Herr L. Löwenstein, the engraver; Mr. W. B. Richmond's portraits of "May," a young girl at the piano, and Miss Rose and Miss Dora Mirlees, pictures in the style of Gainsborough's portraits; Mr. Orchardson's "Farmer's Daughter;" Mr. G. Watts' portraits of Lord Salisbury and Lord Lytton, and his landscape "Rain passing away."

The winter exhibition was composed of the works of Thomas Gainsborough and Richard Doyle. The former proved a fitting complement to the Reynolds display of the previous winter. The number of works by the former artist brought together on this occasion was 216, comprising the Duke of Westminster's "Blue Boy," Colonel St. Leger (from Hampton Court), David Garrick (from Stratford-on-Avon), Lord Spencer's "Duchess of Devonshire," "The Cottage Girl," "Packhorse Bridge," "The Cottage Door," "Going to Market," and "The Harvest Waggon." There was also a very interesting collection of portraits of the members of Gainsborough's own family, amongst which that of his nephew, Gainsborough Dupont, was the most conspicuous; and several likenesses of his associates and friends, such as Tenducci the tenor, Karl Abel the musician, Margaret Burr (the painter's wife), Fischer the hautbois player (his son-in-law), and Felice de Giardini the violinist.

In addition to the foregoing there were the usual exhibitions of the Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours, of the Institute of Painters in Oils, and of Painters in Water Colours, of the British Artists (Suffolk Street), of the Dudley Gallery Art Society—the old Dudley Gallery under a new name and a new management—of the Society of Lady Artists, and of Painter Etchers, besides an almost innumerable number of exhibitions at the galleries of Messrs. Agnew, Graves, Wallis, and Dowdeswell.

Art Sales.—The most remarkable art sale was that of the "Fountaine" collection of majolica, Limoges enamel, and Henri Deux ware, which realized 91,113*l.*, a single Limoges enamel 7,358*l.*, and three pieces of Henri Deux ware 6,458*l.* The pictures (chiefly modern) of Mr. Crompton Potter brought 32,558*l.*; those of the Leigh Court Gallery, belonging to Sir Philip Miles, 28,956*l.*; Lord Lonsborough's, 11,358*l.*; Mr. Charles Shipper's, 16,143*l.* (modern); Mr. Albert Levy's (ancient), 14,359*l.*; Mr. St. John Dent's engravings, 9,089*l.*; the water-colour drawings of Mr. Edward Sutton, 6,939*l.*; the pictures and drawings of Mr. G. F. Lees and Mrs. Henry Wilson, 11,322*l.*; and the Fountaine collection of engravings, 5,165*l.*

The highest price paid for a single picture (except the Blenheim Raphael) was 6,510*l.*, given for Sir E. Landseer's "Monarch of the Glen," which had

been originally sold for 367*l.* Turner's "Dunstanborough," which had in 1876 been sold for 2,200*l.*, only realised 945*l.*; whilst a picture by David Cox, "Rosenau," which at the Gillott sale was disposed of for 922*l.*, fetched 1,945*l.* On the other hand, the "Skirts of the Wood," by the same artist, which had been bought at the same sale for 2,315*l.*, declined to 1,417*l.*

II. THE DRAMA.

The retrospect of the year inspires satisfaction or the reverse according to the point of view from which it is taken. The supply of original work of anything like serious purpose has been somewhat scanty, and not always of the highest quality. On the other hand, the year is memorable for successful runs, brilliant revivals, and scenic splendour. Lovers of the legitimate drama cannot complain that it has been neglected, though they may regret that the contributions to its repertory have not been more numerous and more valuable.

To begin with original work, Messrs. Herman and Will's "Claudian," which appeared towards the close of last year, after a most successful run at the Princess's, was followed on May 22 by Messrs. Jones and Herman's "Chatterton," Mr. Wilson Barrett giving a striking delineation of the unfortunate poet. "Low Water," by Mr. Pinero, produced at the Globe on January 12, apparently without the full concurrence of the author, was an unfortunate event, in spite of the efforts of a cast in the main efficient. Miss Abington and Messrs. Cartwright, Carter, and J. F. Young did all in their power to save the piece from failure, but failed to triumph over certain incongruities which might have been eliminated on revision; for the work was not destitute of situations fully worthy of the author's recognised talent. Another play, which, though it could hardly be called a success, exhibited qualities indicative of higher achievements in the future, was Mr. Brander Matthews' three-act comedy "Margery's Lovers," produced at the Court on February 18, with Mesdames Wood and Tree, and Messrs. Cecil, Clayton, Mackintosh, and C. Coote in the principal parts. Mr. W. S. Gilbert's one-act drama "Comedy and Tragedy," produced at the Lyceum on January 26, was founded on a very free treatment of an historical subject. The part of Clarice, which was filled by Miss Mary Anderson, offered great opportunities for a hit; but opinion was far from unanimous as to the extent to which those opportunities were turned to account by the American actress.

Mr. Bronson Howard's "Young Mrs. Winthrop" came out in America, and was performed for the sake of the copyright at the Marylebone Theatre in 1882, but its virtual production in England dates from November 6, 1884, when it appeared at the Court. Without any startling features in the way of dramatic construction, it secured a hold on the audience by well-written dialogue and the possession of the indefinite quality of "charm," which the cast, comprising Miss Marion Terry, Mrs. J. Wood, Miss Lydia Foote, and Messrs. Conway and Cecil, did their best to maintain. It outlasted the year, and promised well. "Lottie," an anonymous three-act comedy produced at the Novelty on November 20, was a failure, as was also Mr. Burnand's "Just in Time," a drama in three acts which came out at the Avenue on November 12. Mr. H. A. Jones' five-act play "Saints and Sinners"

Vaudeville, September 25) was at first received without any very great cordiality, and encountered adverse criticism in various quarters as treading on delicate ground. Nevertheless, with the aid of an efficient cast, it succeeded in taking possession of the public taste, achieved an excellent run, and must be chronicled as one of the most successful new plays of the year. Good specimens of a lighter kind of work were Mr. G. W. Godfrey's *Levee de rideau*, "My Milliner's Bill" (Court, March 6), "Nita's First," a farcical comedy by T. G. Warren, originally produced in Oxford (Novelty, March 4), and "A Mint of Money" by Arthur Law (Toole's, January 10). Perhaps on the whole a larger share of success fell to the adapter than to the producer of original work.

Mr. C. H. Hawtreys version of Von Möser's "Der Bibliothekar," under the name of "The Private Secretary," originally produced at Cambridge in 1883, which made its first appearance in London at the Prince's on March 29, was particularly fortunate. After a moderate run at this theatre it was transferred to the Globe, the cast being modified by the substitution of Mr. Penley for Mr. B. Tree. Its success was complete, lasting into the new year with every sign of continuance. Equally popular, though in a very different line, was Mr. Pinero's adaptation of M. Ohnet's "Maitre de Forges," under the name of "The Ironmaster," introduced at the St. James's on April 17. Mr. and Mrs. Kendal, supported by Miss Linda Dietz, Mrs. Gaston Murray, and Messrs. Sugden, J. F. Young, and Waring, contributed largely to the position achieved by this piece as one of the most striking successes of the year. A French play written some fifty years back, entitled "Un Duel sous Richelieu," furnished the younger Mr. Boucicault with material for a four-act play called "Devotion," which was produced at the Court on May 1, with the support of a very strong cast, including Miss Ada Cavendish and Messrs. Conway and Clayton. At the Haymarket two adaptations, the one from a French, the other from a German source, were given, viz. "Evergreen," by Mr. W. H. Pollock, from MM. Jaimé and Bayard's "Le Réveil du Lion" (August 9), and "Bachelors," by Robert Buchanan and H. Vezin. They were chiefly remarkable for the clever acting of Mr. Brookfield. "Featherbrain," a version by Mr. Albery of the French play "Tête de Linotte," which was produced at the Criterion on June 23, was not at first very successful; but on resumption in the autumn it gained greatly in vivacity and general attractiveness, and eventually became very popular. It was amusingly played by Mons. Marius, Messrs. Maltby, Giddens, and Blakeley, and by Misses Jansen, Saker, and Eveson.

"The Candidate," an English version of a quite recent piece at the Théâtre Français, written by M. Bisson, and adapted, as was understood, by a member of Parliament, was not produced at the Criterion till November 22; but it gave every promise of a brilliant career. It was generally admitted to be one of the best specimens of the kind of farcical comedy which this theatre has made peculiarly its own, and Mr. Wyndham in the part of Lord Oldacres was quite at his best. Mr. Herman Vezin's two-act comedy "The Little Viscount," produced at the Gaiety on August 2, was adapted from M. Bayard's "Le Vicomte de Letourrière, and Mr. W. D. Howells drew on a Spanish source for his tragic drama "Yorick's Love," originally produced in America, in which the American actor Mr. Laurence Barrett appeared at the Lyceum on April 12. "Breaking a Butterfly," a three-act play given at the Prince's on March 3, was a version by Messrs. Jones and Herman of Ibsen's Swedish drama "Norah." The work of the

novelist has also furnished abundant material for stage purposes. Three of Ouida's novels—viz. "Under Two Flags" (Pavilion, November 8), "Folle Farine" (Sadler's Wells, October 18), and "Moths" (Strand, June 26)—were dramatised respectively by George Daventry, W. Avondale, and Mervyn Dallas, the title of the book being retained in each case, but none with more than moderate success. Charles Dickens' "Old Curiosity Shop" furnished his son with the material for a drama of the same name played at the Opéra Comique on January 12; and at the same theatre, on March 26, Mr. Palgrave Simpson welded the story of "Bleak House" into a four-act drama entitled "Lady Dedlock's Secret." By far the most striking success, however, in this was the adaptation by Messrs. Hugh Conway and Comyns Carr of the former's thrilling story, "Called Back." This play, in three acts with a prologue, was produced at the Prince's on May 20, and achieved a very remarkable run. The cast comprised Messrs. Kyrle Bellew and Beerbohm Tree, the latter of whom gave a very able character-study in the part of Macari. George Eliot's "Adam Bede," dramatised by Mr. Howell Poole, was received with some favour at the Holborn (June 2).

Shakespearian revivals have afforded opportunities for an extraordinary amount of scenic display. At the Lyceum, Mr. Irving utilised the interval between his first and second expedition to America to revive "Twelfth Night" with great splendour. His Malvolio was variously criticised. Like all his conceptions, it was admittedly original and carefully studied, but the impression on the whole was that it will scarcely take rank as one of his most successful impersonations. During the absence of Mr. Irving on his American tour, where he was accorded a series of most gratifying receptions, Mr. Abbey, the well-known New York manager, assumed the direction of the Lyceum season, of which Miss Mary Anderson was the chief attraction. A revival of "Pygmalion and Galatea" showed the American actress perhaps at her best; but her performance of Juliet, which followed thereon, was received with great enthusiasm by her very numerous admirers. Mr. Terriss as Romeo also found much popular approval, and distinctly advanced his growing reputation. Mr. Standing was a good Mercutio, and Mrs. Stirling an admirable Nurse. The *mise-en-scène* was highly elaborate and artistic, though, in the opinion of many, the effect of the play was weakened rather than strengthened by too obvious attempts at local accuracy. Mr. Wilson Barrett's production of "Hamlet" at the Princess's, which took place in the middle of October, was one of the principal theatrical events of the year. The actor's conception of the part was original, and revealed a vast amount of careful study, and it at once took possession of public attention. The piece was produced in an unconventional style. By making Hamlet a very young man, it was possible to make the Queen a young woman, and thus to heighten the interest by supposing the King to be actuated in committing the murder less by personal ambition than by the desire of gaining the Queen's hand. This device, however unorthodox, tended to relieve the habitual gloom of the play, a result to which Miss Leighton's personal attractions and vivacious acting contributed in no small degree. The scenery and stage arrangement were contrived in the same spirit, and greatly brightened the usually sombre tone. Miss Eastlake was a good Ophelia, and Mr. Willard an efficient King. Mr. Clifford Cooper as Polonius, Mr. Dewhurst as the Ghost, Mr. Crauford as Horatio, and Mr. Frank Cooper as Laertes were all painstaking, and in the main satisfactory. "The Rivals" was revived at the Haymarket with considerable pomp. Mrs. Stirling was admirable as ever in

the part of Mrs. Malaprop. Bob Acres fell into the hands of Mr. Lionel Brough, who gave a thoroughly humorous interpretation of the part. Sir Anthony was played by Mr. Pinero, Falkland by Mr. Bancroft, and Julia and Lydia by Mrs. Bernard Beere and Miss Calhoun respectively. Later on in the year, "Diplomacy," the English version of M. Sardou's powerful play "Dora" was revived at this theatre in what was announced to the general regret as the last season of Mr. and Mrs. Bancroft's management. The re-appearance of this piece, which was first played at the Prince of Wales' in 1878, was generally welcomed, and the performance gave much satisfaction. Miss Calhoun was a creditable Dora, and Mrs. Bernard Beere gave a very fine rendering of the part of the Countess. Mrs. Bancroft as Lady Fairfax was, as usual, vivacious and pleasing. In the revival of Mr. Gilbert's "Dan'l Druce," which took place at the Court on March 6, Mr. Herman Vezin renewed his powerful performance of the Puritan blacksmith, Mr. Clayton played Sir Jasper, and Miss Fortescue, who now returned to the stage, took the part of Dorothy. At Drury Lane Mr. Augustus Harris reproduced "The World" in his usual brilliant manner, and at the Strand "Our Boys" proved that, notwithstanding its enormous run on its first appearance, it was still able to command public attention and favour. Mr. David James resumed his original part of Perkyn Middlewick. "The Two Orphans" was revived at the Olympic in March, and "New Men and Old Acres" at the Court in the autumn, with a cast which comprised Miss Marion Terry, Mrs. John Wood, and Messrs. Clayton and Arthur Cecil. "In the Ranks," the highly popular melodrama by Messrs. G. R. Sims and H. Pettitt, first produced at the Adelphi in October 1883, carried off the honours of the year as regards the length of its run, being played without a break throughout the year, and showing at its close every sign of continuing prosperity. The credit of so phenomenal a success must be divided between the authors, who have known how to invest the leading scenes with a spirit which appeals to the sympathies of the many, and the excellent cast, which comprised Miss Isabel Bateman, and Messrs. C. Warner and John Ryder.

Of comic operetta and opera bouffe there was a fairly abundant supply. Sir A. Sullivan and Mr. Gilbert this year laid hands on the Poet Laureate's work for the material for their new piece "Princess Ida," which was produced at the "Savoy" early in the year. The popularity achieved by this their latest joint effort, though perhaps somewhat less marked than that of its predecessors, was sufficient to secure for it a long run, and when it was withdrawn in the autumn the revival of "The Sorcerer" and "Trial by Jury" was so successful as to place the author's continued hold on the public taste beyond all doubt. "Nell Gwynne," *libretto* by H. B. Farnie, music by Robert Planquette (Avenue, February 7), and "The Beggar Student," adapted from the German by W. Beatty-Kingston, the music by Millöcker (Alhambra, April 12), were both favourable specimens of comic opera. At the Comedy Theatre, "The Grand Mogul," described as an "Oriental faerie," the music by Andran, and the *libretto* adapted by Mr. H. B. Farnie from the French of Messrs. Chivot and Duru (November 17), achieved considerable success, largely due to stage accessories. "Dick," a two-act operetta by A. Murray, music by E. Jacobowski, appeared at the Globe on April 17; and "Polly," by Messrs. Mortimer and E. Solomon, at the Novelty, October 4; the latter, which owed a good deal to Messrs. Gilbert and Sullivan's "H.M.S. Pinafore," being afterwards transferred to the new Empire Theatre. Of burlesque there were many specimens, among the most successful being Mr. Burnand's

"Paw Claudian," in which Mr. Toole made a great hit (Toole's Theatre, February 14); "The Babes," by Mr. Paulton (Toole's, September 9); and Mr. Burnand's "Camaralzaman" (Gaiety, January 31). Mr. Herman Merivale's "Called There and Back," a travesty of Mr. Hugh Conway's successful drama, was dull (Gaiety, October 15); but the same theatre did better on November 29 with "Very Little Hamlet," a clever take-off of the "Hamlet" of Mr. Wilson Barrett's company at the Princess's.

Signor Salvini gave a series of his powerful impersonations at Covent Garden in the spring, playing Macbeth and King Lear with a force inferior only to that of his Othello. In Soumet's "Gladiators," considered one of his finest parts, he was very strongly supported by Signora Piamonti. Another welcome visitor was Madame Judic, who came to the Gaiety in June; and later on in the year a stock French company, comprising some excellent artists, was established at the Royalty, under the direction of M. Mayer. Their renderings of good French comedy were among the leading theatrical events of the year, and the venture was successful enough, it is hoped, to bring the establishment of a permanent French theatre in London within the range of probability.

III. MUSIC.

The recent encroachments on the monopoly of dramatic music so long held by Italian Opera have this year shown no signs of abatement. Threatened institutions, however, often live long; at all events, it may be hoped that great advance will be made by the rival organisations, both in regard to the matter produced and to the execution of it, before the older competitor is driven from the stage.

The first operatic troupe to take the field was the "Royal English Opera Company," which opened a season of four weeks at Covent Garden on January 7. It was composed mainly of members or ex-members of Mr. Carl Rosa's company, and comprised some very competent vocalists. Speaking generally, the repertory contained little beyond the most hackneyed operas, while neither of the two novelties produced was particularly fortunate. The "Piper of Hamelin" is from the pen of Victor Neesler, *chef d'orchestre* at the Theatre at Leipzig. The *libretto*, with the main incidents of which everybody is acquainted through the medium of Mr. Browning's poem, was prepared for the English stage by Mr. Henry Hersee. Though containing some excellent musical writing, the work nowhere rises to the level necessary to secure an enthusiastic welcome; the performance—though Madame Rose Hersee as the heroine, Mr. C. Lyall in the comic part of the Town Clerk, and Mr. Sauvage as the Piper were all good—was, on the whole, scarcely of a quality to atone for the deficiencies of the piece. Mr. Julian Edward's "Victorian," adapted by Mr. J. F. Anderson from Longfellow's "Spanish Student," was still less happy, and may be best regarded as the maiden operatic effort of a composer not destitute of gifts, among them that of melody.

Mr. Carl Rosa commenced a short season at Drury Lane on April 14 with a highly satisfactory company, comprising most of the artists who have followed his fortunes, it may be hoped to their mutual advantage. Mr. Mackenzie's "Colombe" and Mr. Goring Thomas's "Esmeralda" so successfully

produced last year, were well given and received with the warmest favour; Madame Marie Roze achieving a very marked success as the heroine in the former work. Mr. Barton McGuckin, whose fine voice makes him a valuable acquisition under any circumstances, showed to far better advantage than formerly as a dramatic artist: his performances as Orso in "Colomba," Wilhelm Meister in "Mignon," and as Don José in "Carmen," materially advancing him in popular estimation. When it is added that the tenor music in "Lucia" and in "Trovatore" was sung by Mr. Maas, enough will have been said to show that in that important department, the inferiority which has been so sadly manifest of late years in almost every opera company was not felt during Mr. Carl Rosa's short season. Mr. Barrington Foote, who has now joined this company, showed to advantage as Brando Savelli in "Colomba," and Miss Marion Burton as Frederica in "Mignon" and other parts was a great acquisition. The novelty of the season was Mr. Villiers Stanford's "Canterbury Pilgrims," written to a *libretto* by Mr. Gilbert à Beckett, and produced with gratifying success on April 28. The humorous tone of the play is well suited to the style in which Mr. Villiers Stanford seems most at home. The performance was very satisfactory, and Mr. Stanford, who conducted in person, was very well received. Miss Clara Perry as the heroine, and Miss Burton as Dame Margery, were efficient representatives vocally and histrionically of their respective parts, while Messrs. Davies, Snazelle, Ludwig, and Barrington Foote sustained the male rôles in a satisfactory manner. Mr. Gye's season of Italian Opera at Covent Garden was supported as usual, in the soprano department at all events, by a very powerful array of talent: Mesdames Patti, Sembrich, Albani, Lucca, Durand and Fursch-Madi all reappearing. Mdlla. Laterner as a new comer showed promise, and Mdlla. Leria, who made her *début* in the part of Margherita di Valois, sang the florid music lightly and well, though her voice is wanting in power. The contralto music fell to Madame Tremelli or to Madame Scalchi, and was in either case it is needless to say admirably given. Signor de Reszke's magnificent bass voice was a tower of strength in the many parts he undertook, and Signor Cotogni and M. Devoyod shared the main burden of the baritone work. In tenors the company is still weak by comparison, though Signor Marconi, on whom fell a large share of the responsibilities of this department, made the most conscientious use of the means at his disposal. M. Jourdain, however, is a highly accomplished artist, possessing a fine voice and much dramatic power. Unfortunately, he did not appear till late in the season, when he sustained the part of Sigurd in M. Reyer's opera of that name, the only absolute novelty of the year. It may be hoped that every effort will be made to secure his services for future seasons. The subject of M. Reyer's work is the same as Wagner's "Ring of the Nibelungs," and though its treatment is lighter and makes less call on the endurance of the audience, it is as yet uncertain whether it is destined to keep the stage. The cast—comprising Mesdames Albani, Fursch-Madi, and Reggiani, and Messrs. Jourdain, Devoyod, Soula Croix and De Reszke—was all that could be desired; the orchestra under M. Dupont was remarkable for precision; and the chorus and stage arrangements showed an amount of care which is unfortunately not always conspicuous at the Italian Opera. Ponchielli's "Gioconda" and Boito's "Mefistofele" continued to draw good audiences; and the season, if marked by little novelty, was at all events brightened by some performances of phenomenal excellence. Prominent among such was "Le Nozze di Figaro" with Madame Albani as the Countess, Madame Sem-

brich as Susanna, and Madame Pauline Lucca as Cherubino ; Figaro and the Count falling to Signor Cotogni and Signor De Reszke respectively. Rossini's "Semiramide" with Mesdames Patti and Scalchi ; Gounod's "Romeo e Giulietta" with Madame Albani and Signor Marconi, and "Lucrezia Borgia" with Madame Durand in the title rôle, were pleasant revivals. The production of Mr. Mackenzie's "Colomba," which was announced in the prospectus, had to be postponed till next season ; but Miss Griswold, an American lady coming with a reputation from Paris, who it was understood had been retained for one of the leading parts, appeared instead as Margherita in Gounod's "Faust," and, in spite of a cold, created a highly favourable impression. The office of conductor was filled during the season by Signor Bevignani and M. Dupont. A notable feature of the year was the experiment of running a series of German operas at Covent Garden concurrently with the Italian performances. It cannot be said that the venture was altogether successful, for the defective vocalisation of the German company was brought into stronger relief than would have been the case at any other season of the year. The appearance of Madame Albani, who sang the parts of Elsa and Senta in German, drew however on both occasions large and enthusiastic audiences, and proved that German work with adequate expences possesses the elements of popularity. Mr. Villiers Stanford's "Savonarola," which had been given in Hamburg with some success, was here, partly from insufficient rehearsal, partly owing to the dullness of the subject, a conspicuous failure. Herr Richter as conductor made the most of a far from perfect orchestra. In the autumn Mr. Samuel Hayes opened a cheap season of Italian Opera at Her Majesty's Theatre ; but though the cast comprised some competent artists, the *tout ensemble* was unsatisfactory, and the enterprise speedily ended in a fiasco.

Chamber music received at the Monday and Saturday Popular Concerts the usual efficient presentment, and more than maintained its popularity. It was understood that this, the twenty-sixth season, attracted a larger aggregate audience than any of its predecessors. The discretion of the directors in adhering as they did to the old lines on which these concerts have been so long conducted was thus fully vindicated. The pianoforte work was mainly sustained by Madame Schumann, who reappeared on March 3, after an absence of three years, Mdle. Janotha, M. de Pachmann, Mr. Hallé, and Mesdames Marie Krebs and Zimmermann ; and these well-known artistes were reinforced by Miss Maggie Okey (a pupil of M. de Pachmann) and Miss Agnes Miller. Madame Norman-Neruda and Herr Joachim as leading violinists distanced competition ; but on February 9 the absence of the lady violinist afforded to Miss Emily Shinner, who took her place, an opportunity of showing, not only great mastery of the instrument, but a capacity for rendering concerted music at short notice which promised great things. The practice of presenting a perfect rendering of familiar classical works which has justified the name "Popular Concerts" was varied at intervals by the introduction of novelties, among which may be mentioned Mr. Villiers Stanford's pianoforte sonata in D flat, a meritorious work admirably played by Miss Zimmermann (February 4 and 16) ; a quintette in D, for flute and strings, by Molique (Op. 35), flute by Mr. Svendsen ; and Beethoven's trio for flute, violin, and viola (Op. 25) (both on February 11) ; Schumann's first sonata in F sharp minor, played for the first time at these concerts on March 17 by Madame Schumann ; and Dvorák's second piano trio in F minor (Op. 65), one of the latest works of the composer, which created a

great impression on March 31, the piano part being played by Mr. Oscar Beringer. A remarkably powerful rendering of Beethoven's Waldstein sonata at this concert gained for Madame Schumann a great ovation. The resumption of these concerts on October 27 for the new season brought forward Herr Barth, already known as a sound if somewhat cold pianist, Mdlle. Clotilde Kleeberg, a young French pianist of considerable attainments, and Mdlle. Marie Fromm, understood to be a pupil of Madame Schumann, who gave promise of developing into a highly capable artist.

The experiment tried this season by the Philharmonic Society of entrusting the direction of its concerts to a variety of conductors cannot be said to have been justified by success, although the several artistes chosen were themselves competent enough. An orchestra which has to possess itself of the mind of a new ruler at each concert is of necessity somewhat weighted, and in this case the weight told. In other respects the six concerts of the season given at St. James's Hall on February 21, March 6 and 21, April 23, and May 7 and 28, were calculated to enhance the reputation of this hitherto rather too conservative society. The third concert was rendered specially interesting by the appearance of Herr Anton Dvůřák, and by the production of his new overture "Husitaka," a work of rare originality and power, which, together with his symphony in D and Slavonic rhapsody, gained for the composer a striking ovation. On the same occasion two gipsy songs by the same master were excellently sung by Mr. Winch, an American tenor of some capacity and still greater promise. At the fifth concert Herr Hans von Bülow gave a fine rendering of Raff's almost unknown piano concerto in C minor, and Mr. Santley introduced a novelty in Mr. Goring Thomas's "Scène Religieuse," while the sixth and last was rendered noteworthy by the production, under the composer's auspices, of Mr. Cowen's new symphony in B flat minor.

That the audiences at the Richter concerts were somewhat scantier than of yore is probably due less to any deterioration in the programmes than to the fact of their having now become part of the musical stock-in-trade of the London season. The music of Wagner naturally occupied a prominent place in the *répertoire* of his ablest exponent; but Herr Richter again showed judgment and generosity in lending his great talents ungrudgingly to the performance of work by other composers of dissimilar schools. Mr. Maekenzie's orchestral ballad "La Belle Dame sans Merci;" Brahms's new symphony No. 3, which attracted an interesting audience of *connoisseurs*; and Liszt's third Hungarian rhapsody (for the first time in England) were the leading novelties of the season. A short autumnal series of three concerts was given in October and November, in which, besides a very powerful rendering of Wagner's later work, Liszt's fourth Hungarian rhapsody was given for the first time.

The Royal Albert Hall Choral Society maintained its place as undoubtedly the greatest of existing choral associations. On April 2 Beethoven's *Mass* in D, which had been judiciously postponed from the previous season on account of insufficient time for rehearsal, was given with magnificent effect: the exacting solo parts being filled by Miss Anna Williams, Madame Patey, Mr. Lloyd, and Mr. F. King. The still higher honour of producing for the first time in England the latest work of Wagner, "Parsifal," also belongs to this Society. This important event took place on November 10 before an immense audience, which listened with great interest, and the performance was repeated on the afternoon of November 15. The German artists

engaged for the occasion, Fräulein Malten, Herren Gudehus, Scaria, and Schuegraf, the three first-named of whom had had previous experience of the work on the German stage, were highly efficient, and Mr. Barnby was rewarded at the close with enthusiastic applause.

The London Musical Society, also under the *baton* of Mr. Barnby, continued its successful career at St. James's Hall, the programmes containing much interesting and comparatively unknown music; but the selection as its leading novelty of Schumann's cantata "The King's Son" was enterprising rather than judicious.

At the Crystal Palace, where Mr. Manns still leads his unrivalled orchestra, the first part of the year was somewhat uneventful. The concert of March 22 deserves, however, special mention from the fact that Herr Dvorák, whose visit to England was happily timed with respect to the growth in popularity of his music, personally conducted his "Scherzo Capriccioso" and a Nocturne for strings (Op. 40). The twenty-ninth series of these concerts opened on October 18, with a programme which included Brahms's third symphony (for the first time at Norwood), and an overture by the late Friedrich Smetana on November 22; Mr. Mackenzie's very successful oratorio "The Rose of Sharon" was given, with Mrs. Hutchinson, Miss Hilda Wilson, and Messrs. Lloyd and Santley in the solo parts. The concert of November 29 introduced a new and capable pianist, Herr Blumer, and that on December 6 Herr Heckmann, a violinist of reputation in Germany, but hitherto unheard at the Crystal Palace.

The concerts of the Sacred Harmonic Society were highly successful, particularly that of February 22, when Mr. Cummings conducted Bach's Christmas Oratorio. The skill and energy of this gentleman as choirmaster, combined with the experience of Mr. Hallé as conductor, have now assured to this rejuvenated society a position scarcely if at all inferior to that of its palmiest days. At the opening concert of the next season, on November 7, Mr. Mackenzie's oratorio "The Rose of Sharon," mentioned above, which created a great impression on its production at the Norwich Festival this year, was first introduced to the London public.

Mr. Willing's choir, another offshoot from the old stock of the Sacred Harmonic, which showed a good deal of enterprise, has also done good work. The most interesting of the varied features in its programmes were Mr. E. H. Thorne's setting of the 57th Psalm, written expressly for the society, and the revival of Handel's oratorio "La Resurrezione," written in 1708, a quaint specimen of archaic music. The Bach Choir under Mr. Otto Goldschmidt gave two concerts, and the praiseworthy effort made to keep alive the once unmatched "Leslie's Choir" is, it is understood, to be renewed by Mr. Leslie in person next season.

This year, being the fiftieth anniversary of Sir Julius Benedict's concerts, was celebrated by two concerts given at the Albert Hall in June, in honour of his distinguished services. The composer's own oratorio "St. Peter" was appropriately chosen, supported by a splendid array of talent, and was followed by a miscellaneous programme, an interesting feature of which was the appearance of Madame Sembrich as a violinist of no mean capacity. Five concerts were given at St. James's Hall by Señor Sarasate, affording great delight to amateurs of violin-playing, and rendered enjoyable to all by the assistance of an excellent orchestra under Mr. Cusins. Pianoforte recitals were also given by Madame Essipoff, Dr. von Bülow, and the new French pianist, Mlle. Kleeberg, among others. Want of space forbids any notice

in detail of the numerous suburban societies which continue to maintain and extend the taste for good music ; but it may be mentioned that one of them, the Bow and Bromley Institute, was the first to perform in London Dr. Stainer's cantata " St. Mary Magdalen."

Two great provincial Festivals took place during the autumn. That at Worcester in September was the occasion of a very impressive rendering of Gounod's " Redemption," a work which has entirely justified those critics who assigned to it the foremost place among modern sacred works. This and Dvorák's " Stabat Mater," conducted by the composer, with the " Elijah" and the " Messiah," were given in the Cathedral with an amount of care which reflected great credit on the director, Mr. Done, and were supported by a very powerful company, comprising Madame Albani, Madame Patey, and Messrs. Lloyd and Santley. The secular portion included a cantata, " Hero and Leander," written for the occasion by Mr. C. H. Lloyd, a most promising production, and Dvorák's symphony in D, which gained for the composer, who conducted in person, an enthusiastic welcome.

The Norwich Festival, the twenty-first since the series commenced in 1824, took place in October. Apart from minor novelties it was rendered conspicuous by the production of Mr. Mackenzie's oratorio " The Rose of Sharon," subsequent performances of which, in London, have been noticed above. So striking a work proceeding from the pen of an English composer might be expected to evoke an enthusiastic greeting ; and it received it, not only at the hands of the Norwich audience, but from musical critics generally. Another novelty, also English, was Mr. Villiers Stanford's " Elegiac Ode," a musical setting of Walt Whitman's " Burial Hymn " for President Lincoln. The Festival was supported by Miss Williams, Miss Damian, Madame Patey, and Messrs. Lloyd, Maas, and Santley, and by Miss Nevada, an American soprano who created a very favourable impression. The chorus, trained by Dr. Hill, if occasionally wanting in tone, was remarkable for neatness and precision, and the *ensemble* under Signor Randegger was very satisfactory.

SCIENCE OF THE YEAR 1884.

A RECORD of the Science for the past year would hardly be complete without some reference to the effect which the Health Exhibition will produce in extending and improving the knowledge of science. Among the more important results which that Exhibition has supplied are the statistics collected by Mr. Francis Galton in his Anthropometric Laboratory, as to the physical measurements of some thousands of people of all ages and all classes. These results, when fully tabulated, will serve as useful data for generalisation as to the size, condition, and strength of the middle classes.

The proposed establishment of laboratories for the special study of hygiene is also due to the interest shown in the one which was fitted and kept at work in the Exhibition. The numerous conferences on education and the exhibits for technical and elementary teaching have greatly stimulated the demand for scientific instruction.

While the Health Exhibition was thus educating—and amusing—its visitors in London, the British Association for the Advancement of Science, for the first time in its existence, met outside the limits of the United Kingdom. The bold idea of holding a meeting in Montreal was successfully carried out, the occasion serving not only to give an impetus to science in the Dominion of Canada, but to enable a personal interchange of opinion to take place between eminent scientific men on each side of the Atlantic. The papers read at the Montreal meeting were largely on subjects connected with the geography, ethnography, and resources of the Dominion, though the claims of pure science in the biological, physical, and chemical sections were not overlooked. The more important of the papers then read will be mentioned under their proper heads.

BIOLOGY.

Egg-laying Mammals.—Australia, among its varied forms of life, possesses examples which are not found elsewhere of the lowest family of the Mammalia, called by zoologists the *Monotremata*. One of these is the *Ornithorhynchus* or Duck-mole. This curious animal presents numerous bird-like characteristics. The jaws are produced to form a beak like that of a duck, and their margins are sheathed with horn, and furnished with transverse horny plates. The animal possesses no external ears, and the skeleton resembles that of birds in the extension of the coracoid bones to the anterior end of the sternum. But the strangest fact about this animal is that the young have previously to birth no vascular connection with the mother's system, but are born as in birds or reptiles, as eggs which are subsequently hatched. This important fact has been lately determined by Mr. Caldwell, the holder of the Scholarship founded in memory of the late eminent embryologist, Balfour. Mr. A. H. Caldwell, who went over to Australia to study the development of the *Monotremata* and their next allies, the marsupials, has reason to congratulate himself on being able to

put beyond doubt the existence of a phenomenon as unexpected as it is interesting.

So important is this discovery considered, that Professor Liversedge, of Sydney, telegraphed the intelligence to Montreal, to enable the President of the Biological Section to announce the fact to the assembled members. It may be added that the *Echidna*, the only other member of the *Monotremata*, shares this remarkable function with the Duck-mole.

New Species of Wild Horse.—The genus *Equus* consists in the present day of two sub-genera, of which the horse and the ass are respectively types. Until lately all the wild specimens of the genus belonged to the ass type, but a Russian traveller, M. Przevalsky, has lately published an account of a new variety of the horse which he met with in his travels in 1881 in the deserts near the Altai Mountains. The typical horse differs from the ass in having the hind legs as well as the fore legs decorated with warts, a flowing mane instead of a short upright ridge of hair, a forelock falling over the forehead, and a tail in which the long hairs start from the base, and are not confined to a tuft at the end of the tail, as in the asses. The new discovery of M. Przevalsky is intermediate in character between these two typical forms. Thus it possesses the stiff upright mane of the ass, has no forelock, and the long hairs on its tail do not start from the base, but from a point about half-way down the tail. While in these details it resembles the ass, it has the warts on the hind legs peculiar to the horse, smaller ears than the asses, and broad round hoofs like the true horse; and in addition the stripe down the back, always present in the asses, and sometimes present in the horse, is absent in this variety, to which, in honour of its discoverer, the technical name of *Equus Przevalskii* has been given. It is whitish grey in general colour, with short thick legs, large and heavy-looking head, and of small stature. The discovery of this animal is interesting on account of the possible light it may throw on the origin of our domestic horse, which is not believed to exist anywhere in an aboriginally wild condition.

The Virus of Hydrophobia.—M. Pasteur has been experimenting on the virus of hydrophobia, and claims to have succeeded by suitable cultivation in so enfeebling the poison that its inoculation into healthy dogs causes merely locally painful symptoms, from which they soon recover. They are then found to be proof against hydrophobia, M. Pasteur asserting that dogs thus inoculated cannot be rendered hydrophobic by any method. M. Pasteur first inoculated a monkey from a dog affected with rabies, then another monkey from the first, and a third from the second, when it was found that the virus had been sufficiently attenuated. If, instead of monkeys, the virus is passed through rabbits or guinea-pigs, so far from becoming weaker, it actually increases in intensity. Subsequent experiments made by the committee appointed by the French Government to investigate M. Pasteur's experiments have resulted in confirming his discovery.

The Cholera Germ.—Dr. Koch has published a short analysis of his work in connection with the comma-bacillus, which may be summed up as follows :—

1. The comma-bacillus is a specific micro-organism, i.e. it is not merely a form of some other organism, but characteristically distinct from all others.
2. This bacillus is always present in cholera, and in the greatest numbers in the acute cases, and is also the only form of bacillus which is always present.

3. It is never found in other diseases, nor in healthy persons, nor in neighbourhoods where no cholera is or has been.

4. The natural history of cholera agrees with that of the individual comma-bacillus, and no other explanation of the cause of cholera, except the action of this comma-bacillus, is admissible.

Dr. T. Lewis has, however, stated that he has found in the mouth of perfectly healthy persons comma-bacilli identical with those described by Dr. Koch. To this, Dr. Koch replies that though such bacilli are found, they are only apparently alike, and when suitably cultivated in a neutralised gelatine infusion, are seen to undergo a different development from the true comma-bacillus. Professor Ray Lankester also dissents from Dr. Koch's conclusion, pointing out that the fixity of form of bacilli is by no means a proved fact, and that many eminent botanists maintain that there is evidence of the rapid transformation of one form of bacterium into another. Until the pure cultivations of comma-bacillus are proved to be capable of producing cholera in healthy animals the assumption of this bacillus as the cause of cholera is unjustifiable. In opposition to this, Dr. Klein further maintains that, whatever may be the cause of cholera, the poison certainly enters in some cases by the respiratory organs; and that bacilli undistinguishable from the comma-shaped bacilli of Dr. Koch are found in other cases than those of choleraic patients.

CHEMISTRY.

New Method of Organic Synthesis.—The rapidly extending regions of organic chemistry have been further enlarged by an important discovery, made by Dr. W. H. Perkin, the son of the well-known discoverer of aniline dyes. Organic compounds have been roughly subdivided into two great groups, the so-called "fatty" and "aromatic" series. In the latter, of which benzene is a type, the compound molecule is supposed to be formed of six or more carbon atoms united to some one or more other elements. These carbon atoms are supposed to be attracted or linked to each other, so as to form a closed circuit, such an arrangement being called a benzene 'ring.' In the "fatty" group the carbon atoms are supposed to be linked together to form an open "chain." Dr. Perkin has, however, discovered that by appropriate reactions these open chains can be, so to say, closed up, forming, in the non-aromatic group of compounds, bodies containing the distinctive features of a closed ring of carbon atoms, as seen in the aromatic series. A similar reaction in a special instance has been simultaneously discovered by Dr. Japp.

The Manufacture of Soda and Chlorine.—Important improvements in the manufacture of soda, and of chlorine for bleaching powder, have been introduced by the labours of Mr. W. Weldon and M. Pechiney.

This process depends upon the decomposition of the ammonium chloride found in the first stage of the ammonia process by magnesia. The magnesia unites with the chlorine, forming a body known as oxychloride of magnesia, and setting free the ammonia. This oxychloride is then submitted to the action of a current of heated air, which re-forms magnesia, and sets free some of the chlorine gas contained in the oxychloride. The chlorine gas, which is more or less diluted with nitrogen from the air, can then be used in the preparation of bleaching powder.

In the process devised by Messrs. Carey, Gaskell, & Hunter a mixture of equivalent quantities of sulphate of ammonia and sulphate of soda is melted together, and steam passed through the fluid mass. The ammonia contained in

the sulphate of ammonia is liberated as gas, and the sulphuric acid is set free. This free acid then unites with the sulphate of soda to form bisulphate or acid sulphate of soda. By treating this bisulphate of soda with common salt (chloride of sodium), sulphate of soda and hydrochloric acid are formed. This sulphate of soda may now be converted into carbonate of soda by the usual ammonia process, ammonium sulphate being again formed as a bye-product, ready to take part in another series of transformations.

The firm of MM. Pechiney & Cie. are also working a process founded on Mr. Weldon's well-known "manganese" method. The black oxide of manganese is heated with hydrochloric acid, when chlorine gas and chloride of manganese are formed. The chloride is again treated with the oxide of manganese, and heated air forced through the mixture. In this case nearly all the combined chlorine is liberated as gas. Time, however, will be required before it can be decided whether these new processes are or are not commercially successful. In the former case the already depressed condition of the English manufacture of soda will be still further accentuated.

Specific Magnetic Rotation in Chemical Compounds.—If a ray of polarised light is transmitted through a transparent medium which is suspended between the poles of an electro-magnet, and which is therefore subject to a magnetic stress, it is found that this ray of light has been rotated through a certain angle, the direction of which depends on the direction of the magnetic pole, but the amount of which depends upon the substance experimented on. Dr. W. H. Perkin has investigated the magnetic rotation due to a large number of liquid chemical compounds. The pure liquids were placed between the poles of a powerful electro-magnet, in which the direction of the current could be rapidly reversed, and the amount of the magnetic rotation was then determined. In order to make the results obtained from different substances comparable with one another the results were recalculated for a length of a column of each liquid, such as would be found by the condensation of a unit-length of its vapour. By this means Dr. Perkin discovered that the specific rotary power of an atom is a constant quantity, which gives chemists another independent method of determining the molecular constitution of substances of equal value to those at present used, which are based on the determination of specific volumes or of their refractive indices. The numbers calculated from the constants thus obtained agreed very closely with those found by experiment.

Catalytic Action of Water.—There are a large number of reactions between two bodies, in which the presence of a third body is necessary, which third body is found at the conclusion of the reaction unaltered in amount. Mr. H. B. Dixon has shown that a mixture of carbonic oxide and oxygen will not explode unless at least a trace of water is present; and the same holds true of a mixture of carbonic oxide and nitrous oxide. In both these cases the two combining bodies have strong chemical affinity for each other, but the presence of water appears to be necessary to start the reaction. Mr. E. P. Dunnington has discovered also that silver will not tarnish in perfectly dry sulphuretted hydrogen, the presence of water being also necessary in this case.

PHYSICS.

New Pattern of Safety Lamp.—An ingenious application of magnetism has been used in Germany to obtain a secure method of locking safety lamps. It is well known that any ordinary variety of lock is apt to be tampered with by some of the more reckless miners, and an explosion possibly caused thereby. In this new German pattern the upper part screws into the lower, and is provided on the inside with a set of teeth, and a ratchet which slides over the teeth as it is screwed down, but falls into the teeth and prevents unscrewing. Thus when the lamp is once lighted and screwed down, the miner is quite unable to reopen it without breaking the lamp. To release the ratchet a strong permanent magnet or electro-magnet is used, which is kept in the overlooker's office. This electro-magnet attracts a tail-piece fixed to the ratchet, and draws it out from the teeth, when the lamp can be opened without difficulty.

Electrical Standards.—The Electrical Congress of Paris was engaged in deciding on the particular definition to be adopted of the standard of electrical resistance called the "ohm." The ohm is the name given to the electrical unit of resistance, deduced from the fundamental units of length, mass, and time—the centimetre, gramme, and second. Numerous experimenters have been engaged in determining what would be the length of a column of mercury one square millimetre in section, which would exactly offer this amount of resistance to the passage of a current. This length has been variously determined at from 105 to 107 centimetres in length, the mean of the most accurate determinations being 106.02 cm. Hence the Congress, ignoring the small decimals, have recommended that the legal ohm shall be the resistance of a column of mercury at the temperature of 0° Centigrade, one square millimetre in section, and 106 centimetres long; and this "practical ohm" will differ but little from the "absolute" or British Association ohm of 1864, the practical ohm being equal to 1.0112 B. A. unit. Resistance expressed in B. A. units can be reduced to the practical ohm by multiplying by .9889, the reciprocal of the preceding decimal. Besides the ohm, another electrical standard has to be defined, and for this purpose Lord Rayleigh suggests that advantage be taken of a form of electric cell devised by Mr. Latimer Clark. The metals used in this cell are zinc immersed in a solution of sulphate of zinc, and mercury in a paste of the protosulphate of mercury. The electro-motive force of this combination remains practically constant, and is equal to 1.435 volts. Lord Rayleigh also finds, from the researches made by Kohlrausch and himself, that the unit of electrical current known as an ampère will separate in one hour 4.025 grammes of metallic silver from a solution of silver nitrate. These determinations will allow accurate electrical standards to be readily obtained.

Balloon Steering.—M. Renard, a captain in the French Corps of Engineers, has constructed a balloon which is intended to be capable of being steered in any given direction. The balloon is an ellipsoid in form, being sixty metres long and ten metres in diameter. The car is fitted with a long platform, at one end of which is the space for the voyagers, and at the other is the steering machinery, consisting of a dynamo-electric machine acting on a large screw, and a rudder some ten metres square. An ascent made on August 9 was very successful; the balloon, after a run of two miles, being steered back to its starting-point, but subsequent trials have been practically

unsuccessful ; and it is doubtful whether, on mechanical grounds, it will be ever possible to drive so large an object as a balloon against even a gentle wind by any machinery such a balloon may be able to carry.

GEOLOGY AND PALÆONTOLOGY.

Determination of the Age of Strata by their Fossil Remains.—

At the British Association meeting Mr. W. T. Blanford drew attention to the increasing number of cases in which strata, containing fossils specifically identical, belong to different geological formations. It used to be considered that the presence of the same fossil species in two beds at different localities was sufficient evidence that these beds were of approximately equal age. Professor Huxley was the first to point out that *homotaxis*, or identity of the fauna or flora of two beds, did not necessarily imply their contemporaneous origin, and this caution has been widely extended by Mr. Blanford. The strata to which he has drawn attention are chiefly of *cainozoic* or *mesozoic* rocks ; and the localities which he instances are in Greece, Northern India, and Australia. Then the Pekumi beds in Greece contain the remains of Miocene land animals, with marine shells of Pliocene age, and belong probably, as far as formation is concerned, to the latter rather than the former epoch. Again, in India Mr. Blanford finds a fauna of Triassic age in rocks overlying strata containing plant remains which are Jurassic in character, whereas Jurassic strata are relatively of later formation than the Triassic. In Australia the carboniferous and Jurassic flora are intermixed and overlaid by distinctively fresh-water Permian species. It thus appears that the determination of the age of strata by their fossil remains alone, especially if these remains are terrestrial rather than marine, is extremely doubtful. Mr. Blanford attaches more importance to the evidence afforded by the marine flora and fauna, because he considers that in all past time the land plants and animals have differed more widely from one another in distant lands than do those which have their habitat in the sea. This is certainly the case at present, and it must also be considered that the present accepted order of geological strata is based rather on the evidence of beds formed in the sea than of those formed in fresh water or on land.

Ancient Fossil Fish.—Professor E. W. Claypole described at the meeting of the British Association some lately discovered fossil fish remains, to which he has given the name *Glyptaspis*. The earliest representatives of the great vertebrate family are the fishes, and fish remains have been discovered in England in the lower Ludlow beds of the Upper Silurian. Until the present discovery no fish remains had been found in America in strata older than the carboniferous. Professor Claypole describes the *Glyptaspis* as being larger and slightly different from the allied English form *Pteraspis*. The fossils were found in the variegated shales of Perry County, Pennsylvania, and these shales are referred by Professor Claypole to the Onondaga series of New York, or to an interval between the upper Wenlock and lower Ludlow beds of England. This would give these fossils a still older character than the English fish remains, and would carry back the known appearance of vertebrate life to an epoch still more remote in geological time.

Fossil Skull.—A human skull has been found in the "loess" of Podlaba, in Prague, which, in some of its details, bears a striking resemblance to the well-known Neanderthal skull. The Neanderthal skull is remarkable for the presence of high bony ridges over the eyebrows ; and the skull now

found at Podlaba also possesses these ridges, but is less strongly developed. A skull has also been found at Kankakee, Illinois, in company with the tooth of a mastodon, but this skull was unfortunately injured by the workmen who found it. Though no final conclusion can be drawn from a single instance such as this, yet the incident may be held to support the theory that man and the mastodon were contemporaneous in America.

Fossil Reptiles from the Jurassic Strata of America.—Professor O. C. Marsh, of Yale College, to whom the discovery of the toothed birds is due, has, by his recent investigations on the fossils of the Jurassic strata of the Rocky Mountains, added still further to our knowledge of intermediate forms between the Aves and the Reptilia. The group of fossil reptiles known as Dinosaurs has long been remarkable for certain curious resemblances to birds which it presents. These resemblances have now been largely increased by the discovery of a peculiar horned reptile, to which he has given the name of *Ceratosauros*. In this reptile the bones of the pelvis and the metatarsal bones are co-ossified as in birds, and the vertebræ are plane in front and concave behind. In this shape of the vertebræ the *ceratosauros* resembles the rest of the Dinosaurian family, but the co-ossification of the pelvic bones is peculiar to that sub-genus. But to fully appreciate this point it must be remembered that the oldest fossil bird, the *archæopteryx*, has the pelvic bones separate, and the metatarsal bones, though co-ossified, marked by deep grooves, so that the oldest bird known was more reptilian in certain characteristics than reptiles of the same geologic epoch. Professor Marsh has discovered that the fossil reptiles found at Stuttgart, known as *aetosauri*, had their bones more pierced with air canals than the flying pterodactyles, and even more than is the case in some orders of birds. It will thus be seen that the gaps between two of the great divisions of the vertebrate animals are fast being filled up.

The Age of the Crystalline Rocks of Durness.—The results of the work of Messrs. Peach and Horne, of the Geological Survey of Scotland, have helped to clear up one of the disputed questions as to the age of certain crystalline schists of Sutherlandshire, which Professor Murchison had set down as being of Upper Silurian age. These crystalline schists rest on a series of undoubtedly Lower Silurian limestones, as shown by the Mollusca found in them, but the schists themselves are quite devoid of life. Murchison was satisfied that the position of these schists was sufficient evidence on which to determine their age as being later than these Lower Silurian rocks below, but this view has been often attacked, especially by Professors Nicol and Lapworth. The careful mapping of the Eriboll and Durness districts by Messrs. Peach and Horne has shown that the position of these crystalline schists is due to a series of "prodigious terrestrial displacements, to which there is certainly no parallel in Britain," the strata having been folded, dislocated, and crushed, so that older rocks have been pushed over younger ones, accompanied, as is usual, by metamorphic changes in the strata themselves, which have given them their present highly crystalline and azoic character.

Triassic Rocks under London.—A deep boring at Richmond, in Surrey, has revealed the presence of the great oolite strata under the London basin. In a clay stratum of only six inches in thickness a large number of fossil remains of Brachiopods and Echinoderms were found, which served to give the age of the deposit. Under these great oolite strata were found rocks which, from their mineral characters, have been classed as Triassic, a formation which has not been previously detected under London with certainty.

Recent Earthquake Shocks.—An earthquake at Tokio took place on October 15, which was felt over the greater part of Japan. This earthquake was fortunately unattended with severe results. The end of the year was marked by severe earthquakes in Spain and Portugal, which not only destroyed property over a wide-spread area, but which also caused a great loss of life. Our own islands have not been exempt from shocks. In fact, the surface of the earth is always in a state of tremor or unrest, though fortunately these tremors are not generally of such magnitude as to be harmful, or even noticeable unless with the aid of the seismometer. The most important shock in England during the past year is that known as the Essex earthquake.

The Essex Earthquake.—On April 22 the north-eastern parts of Essex were visited by an earthquake which did considerable damage to churches, farm buildings, and cottages, over an area reaching from the northern shore of the river Blackwater six miles northward in the direction of Colchester. In Wivenhoe one observer states that the town looked as if it had been bombarded, so wide-spread was the damage; and Langenhoe Church was so shaken as to be a complete ruin. At Fingringhoe the chimney-stacks were twisted in such a manner as appeared to show that the direction of the shock was from nearly south-west to north-east. The shock was faintly felt in Suffolk, London, Cambridge, and elsewhere, and even as far as Bristol, Birmingham, and the Isle of Wight. The area chiefly affected is situated on the London clay, lying on chalk and gault clay. Mr. Topley concludes, from the nature and extent of the shock, that the range of the earthquake is connected with the range of the Palæozoic rocks, while the effects are largely due to the nature and thickness of the newer rocks. As is usual in earthquake shocks, the springs and wells were affected. One spring in West Mersea ceased to flow for a short time, and when its flow recommenced the water was strongly discoloured, while a well in Messrs. Courtauld's brewery, at Bocking, showed an increased depth of water of nearly twenty feet, gradually increasing day by day up to thirty feet. Other earthquakes have occurred at various parts of the globe in more than usual numbers, so that it would seem that a general though slight rearrangement of earth-pressure is taking place over largely separated areas. Greater attention is being given to the registration and investigation of earthquake shocks by means of the seismograph, an instrument which allows the direction, duration, and velocity of any given shock to be determined.

Eruption of Krakatoa.—Although this convulsion of nature took place in August 1883, its phenomena formed the subject of scientific discussion during the past year. The air-waves set in motion by the explosion were shown to have passed three times round the earth before their effects became too feeble to be detected by the rise or fall in the barometer. The speed with which these waves travelled naturally varied greatly, but the average was not less than 700 miles per hour. The readings taken at Mauritius were especially interesting. As this island is far removed from any other land the air-waves were not impeded by local obstacles, and General Strachey has estimated that at Mauritius the air-wave travelled round the earth from east to west in 24 hours 38 min., and from west to east in 35 hours 10 min., the difference in rate being due to the prevailing wind. The collapse of the volcanic peak and its subsidence into the ocean was probably the immediate cause of the gigantic powerful sea-waves which, after sweeping more than 30,000 human beings in the Sunda Straits, and rising in

places to a height of sixty or seventy feet, were spread over the Indian and Atlantic Oceans, past Ceylon and the Cape of Good Hope, even up to the coast of France. Curiously, no true earthquakes were noticed during the period of activity, all the destruction to life and property being caused by either the sea or air-waves. Dr. Verbeck, who was appointed by the Dutch Government to report on the eruption, gives as his opinion that nearly twelve cubic miles of material were ejected by the volcano. Few eruptions in modern times have been so disastrous in their results to human life, or so wide-spread and long-enduring in their effects, as that which will render the 26th, 27th, and 28th of August, 1883, memorable in the annals of geologic history.

ASTRONOMY.

Faculae in the Sun.—M. Trouvelot has announced that as far back as 1878 he observed that certain faculae in the sun cast well-defined shadows, and this has been now corroborated by other observers, such as Father Secchi. On one occasion M. Trouvelot says that it was possible, owing to the position of the spot and the height of the facula above it, to look under the facula and to see part of the penumbra beneath it. On this part of the penumbra M. Trouvelot noticed an extraordinary appearance, which resembled so closely a shadow cast by the overhanging facula as to leave no doubt in his mind that that was the true cause of the phenomenon. From this M. Trouvelot concludes that the light seen in these faculae resides almost wholly on the surface, and is perhaps only produced in presence of the coronal atmosphere.

The Sun's Diameter.—Dr. J. Hilfiker, Assistant Astronomer at the Neufchâtel Observatory, has published a pamphlet in which he discusses the various values which have from time to time been assigned to the sun's diameter. These values show differences not only from year to year, but even from month to month; and Dr. Hilfiker comes to the conclusion that these differences are not due to errors of observation, but express the important fact that the diameter of the sun is by no means an identical quantity at different times. Then Dr. Hilfiker finds that the epoch of greatest diameter is coincident with the epoch of minimum sunspots. He also suggests that this ellipticity of the sun's figure may have effect on the seasons of the year.

The Sun's Temperature.—The temperature of the sun has been studied by M. Hirn, who attempts to calculate the heat of the interior by determining the rate of expansion of a highly-compressed gas. Below the surface of the sun it is probable there exists matter in the gaseous form very strongly heated and under tremendous pressure. When this gas escapes into a higher region where the pressure is greatly reduced the speed of projection can be calculated. In the case of hydrogen M. Hirn finds the velocity with which the gas moves by noting the height above the sun's surface which it attains, and the number of seconds occupied in reaching that height, and by calculating the speed which an equal extent of fall due to gravity would cause at the sun's surface. These two methods yield a result of 200,000 metres per second, from which the temperature of the interior is determined to be upwards of two million degrees Centigrade. The temperature of the photosphere, on the other hand, is put down by M. Hirn as not more than 100,000 degrees, since he considers it certain that the solar light is largely emitted from solid particles which would not be able to exist at higher temperatures except in the state of gas.

The Planets : Jupiter.—The great red spot on Jupiter, first notice

1878, has been watched during the past year with some curious and unexpected results. Thus, from observations made at the Dearborn Observatory, Chicago, by Professor Hough, it appears that its rotation period is slowly increasing, being now four seconds faster than in 1879. In addition, the spot has drifted south, through a distance of half a second of arc, a quantity which, though seemingly minute, is equal to 1,200 miles on the surface of the planet. The great equatorial belt has also moved southwards till its edge is nearly coincident with the middle of the spot, yet the two objects remain quite distinct, the edge of the belt being apparently indented, forming a depression the shape of the red spot, but separated from it by about one second of arc. The satellites of Jupiter have also presented the unusual phenomena of dark transits, which have been carefully noted by competent observers.

Mars.—M. Trouvelot has announced the near completion of a series of observations which he has been making for the last nine years of the planet Mars. He has accumulated 415 careful drawings of the planet, and has a valuable supply of notes on the phenomena, its surface and atmosphere. He hopes when the snows of the north polar circle have diminished to be able to publish a map of Mars of a far more complete character than has previously been obtained. M. Trouvelot remarks that the northern hemisphere is much richer in grey spots than the southern, and that these grey spots change from time to time in a manner which suggests to him that they may be patches of vegetation undergoing the changes of the seasons. The period of rotation of the planet has been re-determined by Mr. Denning, who gives the time of a rotation as 24h. 37m. 22.626s.

New Comets.—The first comet of the present year was discovered on January 7 by a young amateur observer named Ross, at Elsteehwick, Victoria. Its position and orbit were computed by Mr. J. Tebbutt, of the Windsor Observatory, New South Wales. When observed by him it had already become so faint as to be invisible to the naked eye, and was moving away from both the earth and the sun. The observations were made during the latter part of January, and by the middle of February it had passed out of view. The nucleus appeared as a fine circular nebulosity with central condensation; a faint tail was also visible. The spectrum showed the three hydrocarbon bands faint and diffused at the edges. The general appearance of the comet remained the same on subsequent observation.

A new comet was discovered by Mr. E. E. Barnard, of Nashville, Tennessee, on July 16. It is described as possessing no tail, but decided central condensation. Other observations have been obtained of it at Washington and Algiers. Its motion is reported as being slow, so that it is likely to afford time for repeated observations. Mr. Prince describes it as being entirely devoid of nucleus when seen by him in September last, and it has also been under observation by Mr. Common, at Ealing. Its rotation period has been computed at 6.43 years by Professor Morrison, and at 5.50 years by Dr. Berberich.

A small comet was announced by Professor Krüger as discovered at Melbourne on January 12, with a rapid motion towards the south-east.

Comet Pons Brooks.—The comet, the discovery of which by Mr. Brooks was noted last year, turns out to be the Pons Comet discovered in the year 1812, and which was not expected to return till September 1884. There is thus a difference between the observed and the computed calculated orbits, but MM. Schulhof and Bossert, who have computed an ephemeris for

it, have found that there was an uncertainty in the time of its revolution period of at least five years. The spectrum, as examined by Konkoly, showed three bright bands of different lengths and brilliancy, the central one being the finest of the three. The comet varied in brightness from day to day, increasing from the 10th to the 7th magnitude, and again declining to the 12th magnitude in the space of a single month. As stated last year, it possessed at first a well-defined nucleus and no tail, but traces of this usual appendage were noticed by later observers. During the present year its brightness continued to increase up to the middle of January, and then again diminished till, at the end of February, it had relapsed to its original magnitude. The appearance of the comet also varied, having at times a faint nebulous look, without any trace of a bright nucleus, and then changing to a bright, star-like object, with only a slight nebulosity surrounding a sharp, well-defined nucleus. So sudden and erratic have these changes been, that Mr. Wendell, at Harvard, states that on September 22, 1883, it was difficult to believe it was the same object as had been observed on the previous night. In three weeks it varied in diameter from 40" to 2' 20", and then again declined in size and brilliancy.

Universal First Meridian.—The unification of longitude and time, which was the object of the appointment of the Geodetic Congress, has been practically obtained. The congress met on two different occasions, first at Rome and then at Washington. The great majority of the delegates were in favour of adopting the meridian of Greenwich as an initial first meridian, owing to its present widely extended use and to the large number of maps and charts in which it is employed. The railway companies of the United States and Canada have the honour of being the first to adopt a local time-standard based on Greenwich mean time, and the action of the railways has been followed by almost every city and town throughout North America. The local time varies by complete hours from that of Greenwich, the time adopted in the eastern States—known as "Eastern" time—being exactly five hours slower than Greenwich mean time. In the central States the time is six hours behind Greenwich, in the mountain States seven hours, and in the Pacific States eight hours slower than that in this country. This most important change came into use on November 18, 1883, and was at once adopted over nearly 120,000 miles of railroad. The divisions between any two time-regions are, of course, about 15 degrees apart, but are varied to some extent for the sake of making the break of time occur at places where the inconvenience would be the least felt. In addition to the adoption of this standard time in America, the congress have agreed to recommend for astronomical purposes an international time based on the Greenwich first meridian, and counted from 0 to 24 hours, starting from midnight.

GEOGRAPHY.

Polar Meteorological Stations.—The American expedition under Lieutenant Greely has, after undergoing the greatest hardships, at last returned. The attempt to relieve this party made by the steamer *Proteus* resulted in failure, the ship being crushed in the ice and sunk, the crew escaping with difficulty to Cape York, where they were rescued by another United States steamer. The failure of this attempt led to a new expedition being fitted out under the superintendence of General Hazen, consisting of three ships, the *Alert*, *Thetis*, and *Bear*. The *Alert* was presented to the

United States by the English Government, the *Thetis* was selected for them by Mr. Leigh Smith, while the *Bear* was a whaling boat purchased in Newfoundland. The expedition was entrusted to the care of Commander Schley, of the United States Navy, and set sail at the end of April for Upernavik, in North Greenland, and on July 17, two of the vessels, the *Thetis* and *Bear*, arrived at St. John's, Newfoundland, with six survivors of the ill-fated American Polar expedition, among whom was the commander of the party, Lieutenant Greely. The history of the expedition may be shortly described. The first two winters were passed without more than the usual share of Arctic danger and privation, but as the summer of 1883 brought no signs of a relieving ship, the entire party, consisting of twenty-five persons, left their abode in Discovery Harbour at the beginning of August. This was rendered necessary by the decrease in their stock of provisions. The intention of the party was to reach some of the Danish settlements in Greenland, but failing to do this they were obliged to remain as best they were able on the western side of Cape Sabine, near the entrance of Smith Sound. But for the stores which had been left by Sir George Nares in 1882 and by the previous relief expeditions, the whole party would have perished from hunger. As it was the ill-fated men were reduced to the severest straits to supply food, and one by one fell victims to hunger and cold, till only seven were left of the original number of twenty-five. On June 16 the *Bear* arrived at Cape Sabine, after a slow and dangerous passage across Melville Bay. The precise spot was indicated by a cairn which had been erected on Brevoort Island in the previous October, and which was discovered by one of the searching parties from the *Thetis*. The unfortunate commander was found on the verge of death, but is now slowly recovering. Besides the few survivors the journals and observations were saved, and the results obtained have been, if not commensurate with the suffering endured by the expedition, yet of very high value. To Lieutenant Lockwood and Sergeant Brainerd, two of its members, belongs the honour of having passed the most northerly point previously attained. These explorers reached an island off the north coast of Greenland in latitude $83^{\circ} 24'$. They found no land to the north of this island so far as they could see. The sea was covered with ice, and no polar current could be detected in it. To the north-east a headland was visible, to which was given the name of Cape Robert Lincoln. Though no open sea was discovered by these observers, Lieutenant Greely considers that observations made by Dr. Parry and Sergeant Rice, two more of his comrades, prove almost certainly the existence of at least a partially open Polar sea. The tide in Smith Sound was found to flow from the north, and at Cape Sabine from the south, while the northern tide was two degrees warmer than the southern, and had a rise of from eight to twelve feet. Mr. Clements R. Markham has suggested that the high latitude reached by Lieutenant Lockwood and Sergeant Brainerd has been incorrectly stated, owing to these observers having mistaken their locality; but whether this be true or not, the American Polar expedition will always be remarkable for the hardships it has suffered, and the heroic manner in which its commander fought against them.

Lieutenant Ray, of the United States Navy, has also corrected many details in the map of the district round Point Barrow, and has discovered a range of hills running in an easterly direction from Cape Lisburne, to which he has given the name of the Meade Mountains. From this range at least two rivers previously unmarked flow into the Polar Sea.

Africa.—The expedition under Mr. Joseph Thomson, sent out by the Royal Geographical Society, has met with the greatest success. Mr. Thomson, after leaving Taveta early in July 1883, was for nearly a year unable to send any intelligence as to his movements to his friends at Zanzibar, the only news received about him during his absence being a report from a passing caravan at Lake Naivash in the month after his start. Though full details have not yet been published, it is known that after leaving Taveta he again reached Mount Kilimanjaro, estimated to be more than 20,000 feet high. Thence he travelled along the east shore of Lake Nyanza, and from there to Lake M'Baringo, being the first white man to reach its shores. Afterwards he plunged still further inland to Mount Kenia, which he calculates is at least 18,000 feet high; and finally found his way back to the coast without harm, after a journey of about 500 miles, through tribes often hostile and ready to resort to violence on the slenderest pretext. Nearly all the region which he traversed was previously unknown. Mr. Thomson was followed by another explorer, Mr. H. H. Johnston, who started for Kilimanjaro with the object of investigating the flora and fauna of that mountain.

Another African traveller has not been so fortunate. Dr. Pogge, after crossing the southern basin of the Congo, fell a victim to fever, and died at Loando in March. The region between the east coast and the great central lakes has been again explored by Mr. O'Neill, the British Consul at Mozambique. Mr. O'Neill crossed from Mozambique to Lake Shirwa and back, and besides mapping for the first time the shores of this lake, discovered two other lakes north of it, from one of which the river Lujenda flows. The district round Lake Nyassa has been further investigated by the Rev. W. P. Johnson, who has discovered a new route between Lake Shirwa and Quillimane. Further north, Dr. Kaiser has revisited Lake Leopold, previously described by Mr. Joseph Thomson. Dr. Kaiser unfortunately died on the shore of the lake, but his map has been forwarded to Berlin, and shows the lake as a narrow strip of water, between lofty hills, thus confirming Mr. Thomson's observations. Attempts to penetrate into the Galla and Somali countries are still unsuccessful. M. Reveil, who attempted to work his way inland from Magadoxo, had to return owing to the hostility of the native tribes; while Dr. Stecker, a former companion of Dr. Rohlf's, has explored part of the country of the Upper Gallas in Southern Abyssinia. This region, lying between the route travelled by Thomson and the border of Abyssinia, still requires elucidation.

Another French traveller, M. Giraud, has attempted to cross the continent by striking the head-waters of the Congo from the coast at Zanzibar. Leaving this latter place, he passed between Lakes Nyassa and Tanganyika, and reached Bangweolo in July. There he embarked with eight of his men on the Luapula, which he descended for some days, till he finally reached an impassable cataract. Here he was attacked by the natives, made prisoner, and robbed of all his goods. Escaping from these enemies, he rejoined the remainder of his caravan, which he had sent on to Cazembe, but was again plundered of his remaining stores, and was compelled to fly to the Belgian station on Lake Tanganyika, after running considerable risk of dying from hunger. He intends, however, to again make for the Congo as soon as he has obtained a fresh supply of the necessary stores. On the Lower Congo, the rival explorers Stanley and De Brazza are chiefly engaged in establishing trading stations, though not neglecting to add to our geographical knowledge of the Congo and its tributaries. While Mr. Stanley has explored the river

Aruwima for upwards of 100 miles, and discovered two new lakes, *M. de Brazza* has cleared up the region between Ogorvé and the navigable portion of the Congo. One of his officers, Lieutenant Mizon, has also penetrated from the Ogorvé to the Atlantic across country, reaching the coast at Mayumba. Thanks to these and other explorers, the Lower Congo, and in fact Central Africa generally, are becoming rapidly opened up. Thus three steamers are plying on Lake Tanganyika, and two on Lake Nyassa, while more than one hundred stations have been founded by English and French religious or commercial enterprise.

Exploration of New Guinea.—The island of New Guinea has, during the last two years, attracted the attention of several exploring parties, most of which have met with scant success. An expedition fitted out by the Melbourne *Argus*, under the command of Captain Armit, failed even to reach the base of the Owen Stanley mountain range, but was diverted from its direct inland course to a line roughly parallel to the shore, so that after two months' travelling he had not attained a distance of more than twenty miles from the sea. A rival Melbourne newspaper, the *Age*, equipped another expedition, under the leadership of Mr. Morrison. This party took a more direct inland course, but after working its way inland to a distance of thirty-five miles from Port Moresby, while crossing a spur of the Owen Stanley range was attacked by natives and driven back, Mr. Morrison himself being badly wounded. Mr. Chalmers was somewhat more fortunate, having penetrated as much as forty miles inland, and discovered a large river 140 miles west of Port Moresby, on the banks of which are a tribe of natives, reported to be cannibals. When it is considered that the island at Port Moresby has been attacked at almost its narrowest part, it is easily seen that but little progress has yet been made. An expedition under Mr. Wilfred Powell, started with the recommendation of the Royal Geographical Society, came to nothing through lack of funds; and another, on a less ambitious scale, has now been entrusted to Mr. H. O. Forbes, who is known as the successful explorer of Tunis. Mr. Forbes has discarded the Port Moresby route, and will endeavour to penetrate into the interior by a new route from the north-west of the island. To this expedition the Geographical Society has given a grant of £250.

Australia and New Zealand.—The continent of Australia has again been crossed from east to west by Mr. W. Whitfield Mills. Mr. Mills' route lay along the parallel of 28° S. latitude, and extended from Beltana, near Lake Torrens in South Australia, to the coast of West Australia at Northampton. He started from the former place in June 1883, with thirty camels and five Afghans as drivers, and finally reached his destination in January of the present year. He attaches the greatest importance to the employment of camels, since the expedition was on one occasion eleven days without water, and great suffering was caused to the whole party in consequence. Six of the camels died, probably from feeding on some poisonous herbage. Mr. Mills reports that during his journey of 1,600 miles he only discovered three water supplies which would be available throughout the year, though there appears to be little doubt that borings would tap the underground springs which must exist over the large cretaceous area in Central Australia. An artesian well which has been sunk at Turkaninna, in latitude 30° S. and longitude 138° 25' E., has yielded an abundant supply. Mr. Mills' route followed almost entirely that of Mr. W. C. Gosse, and has not, therefore, added much to geographical discovery, except in the direction of making

these regions better known, and determining the conditions of successful exploration in the future. Mr. Mills reports a large area of fair pasture land between the Blyth watershed and the Warburton range; and if the theory of Mr. Brown, the Government geologist, be correct, that the underground water-supply is furnished by the rainfall of the Queensland and northern mountain ranges, this district may ultimately be rendered an important cattle-ranching country. In other parts of Australia useful exploring work has been done by Mr. J. Forrest, a medallist of the Royal Geographical Society, in the Kimberley district; while Mr. Lindsay has discovered a new river, named the Walker, in Arnheim Land, west of the Gulf of Carpentaria, and traced its course for a distance of forty miles. Both observers have added materially to our knowledge of the topography and economic capabilities of these little-known regions. Another traveller, Mr. C. Winnecke, starting from the Warburton River at the Cowarie station, and, like Mr. Mills, employing camels, has sketched upwards of 40,000 square miles of country, as far as the Tarleton range. In the northern part of West Australia the eruption of a volcano has been reported, but no description except that of the natives has been obtained. In this, as in other matters connected with the geography of Australia, it is to be hoped that the recent establishment of the Geographical Society of Australasia will lead to the further stimulus of organised and systematic exploration.

In New Zealand some very successful mountaineering has been accomplished by the Rev. W. S. Green, assisted by two Swiss guides from Grindelwald. Mr. Green has ascended the highest summit of the New Zealand Alps, Mount Cook, which he has ascertained rises 12,300 feet above the sea. Mr. Green describes the ascent as one of extreme difficulty, from the treacherous state of the weather and the difficulty of obtaining supplies.

Central Asia.—The native explorers in the employment of the Indian Survey Department have again done good work in the mountainous regions of Central Asia. One of them, known as A—— K——, has, after a four years' absence, returned to India, having travelled as far as Saitu, in Mongolia. In the course of his wanderings he reached Darchendo, in latitude 31° , the most westerly point reached by Captain Gill in 1877, thus connecting his explorations with those of the previous traveller. He has also discovered that the rivers Sanpoo and Brahmaputra are the same, and that the theory that the former flows into the Irrawaddy is incorrect. The Brahmaputra drains the northern slope of the Himalayas, then bends round their eastern flanks, and finally flows westward into the Ganges. Other native explorers have penetrated the countries of Kashmir, Nipal, Turkestan, and Thibet, all of them being difficult or impossible for a European, owing to the hostility of their rulers. Mr. McNair has, however, succeeded in reaching Chitrae, which is only 200 miles from Peshawur. While the English authorities have been thus working northwards and eastwards, the Russians on their side have been gradually adding to their knowledge of the regions reaching from the Caspian to the great wall of China. Colonel Prjevalski started from Kmalka in November 1883, and crossed the Desert of Gobi during the winter, experiencing a cold below the freezing-point of mercury. After reaching Traidam he intends to explore the source of the Yang-tze-Kiang, and then move on to Northern Thibet in the direction of Lhassa. The Russian Government has also been engaged in the preparation and examination of schemes for the diversion of the river Oxus into the Caspian. Owing to the gradual diminution in the volume of water in this inland sea, the Government are anxious

to find some means to increase the supply, which now is not equal to the immense evaporation. The Oxus formerly flowed into the Caspian, and it is thought that this old connexion might be restored. Mr. George Kennan, an American traveller, and Professor Lentz, of the Académie Impériale des Sciences, have both investigated this question. This year has also seen the practical completion of the primary triangulation for the survey of India. It still requires extension to connect it with Siam on the one side, and with Ceylon, but within India itself the work is now almost finished.

The Panama Canal.—The great engineering problem of carrying a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, a distance of more than forty-six miles, gains in interest with each augmentation in the amount of work already done towards the completion of this magnificent scheme of M. de Lesseps. The difficulties to be overcome are enormous, involving a cutting of the unexampled depth of 400 feet, and 500 feet in width, and an embankment to divert the course of the river Chagres, which will be 110 yards thick at the top, 147 feet high, and more than 2,000 yards long. The necessity of changing the course of the Chagres is owing to the great fluctuations in the volume of its stream, which would render it dangerous to admit it to the canal. The dyke will be placed at Gamboa, near the watershed. As the Chagres is as large as the Seine, the task will be one of great difficulty. According to the latest official returns, the quantity of excavation done each month is rapidly increasing: thus while only 333,000 cubic metres were excavated in November 1883, nearly double that quantity was being moved in the following March, up to which date more than $4\frac{1}{2}$ millions of cubic metres of excavation had been done. Machines of great power and size are being used, which largely take the place of hand labour, and M. de Lesseps appears to feel no doubt that the whole enterprise will be finished in four years from the present time. Should the scheme be crowned with success, the effect on the commerce of the world, and the future of the small republics in Central America, will undoubtedly be immense.

Deep Sea Soundings.—Captain Belknap, of the United States Navy, has been enabled, by an improvement devised by himself in the deep-sea sounding apparatus usually employed, to determine the depths of various parts of the ocean with an accuracy not previously attainable. Most of these soundings were taken in the Pacific Ocean, and the greatest depth measured by him was 4,655 fathoms, off the coast of Japan, showing at that spot a depth of more than five and a quarter miles. Soundings taken off the coast at New York have shown the existence of a deep cleft or valley at the bottom of the Atlantic, in the line of the Hudson River, and extending more than 100 miles seaward from Sandy Hook. This valley probably represents the river bed of the Hudson, at a time when the general level of the eastern States of the American continent was considerably higher than at the present time.

OBITUARY

OF

EMINENT PERSONS DECEASED IN 1884.¹

JANUARY.

Keshub Chunder Sen.—Keshub Chunder Sen, head of the Brahmo-Somaj, or reformed Theistic Church of India, was born in 1838. He received an Anglo-Indian education at Calcutta, and in 1859 identified himself with the New Theistic Church founded in 1830 by the celebrated Rajah Rammohun Roy. The work of the latter had been taken up and extended by a wealthy Hindoo, Debendranath Tagore, of whom Keshub Chunder Sen was for a long time a zealous disciple. The founder of the society had established it upon the basis of the Vedas, but their authority was rejected by Debendranath Tagore, who endeavoured to substitute an eclectic faith founded upon intuition and reason. At the same time, either from conservatism or timidity, he retained many of the old Brahmanical customs and observances, and it was left to Keshub Chunder Sen to institute the important practical reforms which now form one of the most valuable features of the new movement. After trying in vain to carry the members of the society with him, he broke with Debendranath Tagore in 1866, and founded a new society, the Brahmo-Somaj of India. Under his influence the Brahmo followers adopted a system of spiritual Theism resembling on all important points, the systems advocated by Theodore Parker, F. W. Newman, Miss Cobbe, and others in England and America; all idolatrous ceremonies and customs were rejected in social and domestic life, including the distinction of caste. They also encouraged female education, opposed child-marriages, and

associated the sexes in a common faith and worship. In 1870 Keshub Chunder Sen visited England, and by the eloquence and fervour of his addresses he succeeded in awakening a strong interest in the work and development of the Brahmo-Somaj on the part of many of the religious leaders of this country. At one of the meetings which were called to enable him to expound his principles, the chair was taken by Lord Lawrence, who spoke highly of the value of his work in India. After his return to India, some new features were introduced into the practices of the Brahmo-Somaj, which led to dissension and division among its members. Under the guidance of Keshub Chunder Sen the simple Theism of the society gave way to certain mystical doctrines, for which special divine inspiration was claimed, and ritual of the most elaborate description was introduced into the devotional services. In 1882 he introduced the drama, and took a part in a religious play, and one of his latest public utterances was in favour of the Salvation Army work in India. He died, in the forty-sixth year of his age, on January 9.

Earl Grosvenor.—Victor Alexander, Earl Grosvenor, eldest son of the Duke of Westminster, by his marriage with Lady Constance Gertrude Sutherland-Leveson-Gower, fourth daughter of George Granville, second Duke of Sutherland, was born at Stafford House, St. James's, on April 28, 1853, the Queen standing sponsor in person at his Baptism. He was educated at Eton, and in November 1874 he married Lady Libell

¹ These notices are in some cases condensed from the *Times*. Digitized by Google

Mary Lumley, youngest daughter of the Earl of Scarborough, by whom he had issue one son, Hugh Richard Lord Belgrave, and two daughters. He took but little interest in politics, and was content to spend the life of a country gentleman at his Cheshire residence, where he was universally respected. He was a magistrate for Cheshire, and at one time held a lieutenant's commission in the Cheshire Yeomanry Cavalry. He was slightly connected with the turf, and one of his horses, *Reprieve*, achieved some fame by a series of successes in 1883. Lord Grosvenor was passionately fond of mechanical engineering, and was frequently to be found in the railway workshops at Crewe Station, and oftener still driving the "Wild Irishman" between London and Holyhead. At the time of his death there was hardly a driver on the northern section of the London and North-Western Railway to whom Lord Grosvenor's figure was unfamiliar. He died, after a brief illness, January 22, at his residence, Saughton Towers, Chester, and was interred January 25 in the family vault at Eccleston Church, near Eaton Hall.

Marquess of Hertford.—The most noble Francis Hugh George Seymour, Marquess of Hertford, Earl of Hertford and Yarmouth, Viscount Beauchamp of Hache, and Lord Conway, Baron of Ragley, in the Peerage of Great Britain, and Baron Conway, of Killultagh, county Antrim, in the Peerage of Ireland, was the eldest son of the late Admiral Sir George Francis Seymour, G.C.B., G.C.H., and grandson of Lord Hugh Seymour, fifth son of the first Marquess of Hertford. His mother was Georgina Mary, second daughter of the late Admiral the Hon. Sir George Cran-

field Berkeley, G.C.B., and he was born on February 11, 1812. Mr. Seymour was educated at Harrow, entered the army as lieutenant in the Scots Fusilier Guards in July 1827, became captain in 1832, attained the rank of lieutenant-colonel in November 1845, was placed on half-pay in December 1847, and became colonel in the army in June 1854. In May 1860 he was promoted to the rank of major-general, became lieutenant-general in 1868, a general in March 1876, and was placed on the retired list in 1881. For several years he was attached to the household of the Prince Consort as Equerry and Groom of the Robes to his Royal Highness; and afterwards Equerry to her Majesty, and was also for twenty years Deputy Ranger of Windsor Park. In 1870 he succeeded to the family title on the death of his cousin the fourth Marquess. He was appointed Lord Chamberlain of the Queen's Household in February 1874, which high office he filled till May 1879, when he resigned, and was succeeded by the Earl of Mount-Edgcombe. On his appointment as Lord Chamberlain he was made a Privy Councillor, and shortly after his resignation of that office was nominated a Knight Grand Cross of the Order (Civil Division) of the Bath. The Marquess of Hertford married, May 9, 1839, Lady Emily Murray, sixth daughter of William, third Earl of Mansfield, by whom he left surviving issue four sons and five daughters; his eldest son, Hugh de Grey, Earl of Yarmouth, late Comptroller of her Majesty's Household, being his successor in the marquise. Riding a horse, against which he had been warned, he was fatally injured while hunting with the Warwickshire hounds, January 21, and died January 25, at Ragley Hall, his seat near Alcester.

In the same month the following deaths occurred:—On January 1, at Brighton, aged 56, **Charles Watkins Merrifield, F.R.S.**, originally a barrister, but entered the Educational Department of the Privy Council in 1847, and became Principal of the Royal School of Naval Architecture, President of the London Mathematical Society, and the author of several papers on mathematics, and on naval architecture: he acted for many years as editor of Messrs. Longman's *Text-books of Science*. On January 2, in London, aged 77, **Lady Amelia Rose Jebb**, daughter of the second Earl of Chichester, and widow of Major-General Sir Joshua Jebb, R.E., K.C.B., sometime Surveyor-General of Prisons. On January 2, at Mottisfont Abbey, Romsey, aged 85, **Jane Lady Barker-Mill**, daughter of Colonel Swinburne, of Keynsham, Somerset, and widow of Rev. Sir John Barker-Mill, Bart. On January 5, in Kensington, aged 62, **Eliza Dowager Lady Elton**, widow of Sir Arthur Hallam Elton, Bart., of Somersetshire. On January 6, at Berlin, aged 75, **Paul Taglione**, for many years director of the ballet at the Berlin Royal Opera. On January 7, at Falmouth, aged 62, **John Harris**, "The Cornish Poet," the son of a miner; he won the prize in 1864, for the best poem on the Tercentenary of Shakspeare. On January 10, at Hopton Hall, Derbyshire, aged 46, **Colonel Frederick Charles Manningham-Buller**, of the Coldstream Guards, son of Sir Edward Manningham-Buller, Bart., of Dalhorne Hall, Staffordshire. On January 10, at Paris, aged 83,

Theodore de Ratisbonne. A Jew by birth, he was received into the Church at Paris, where he became Superior-General of the Congregations of Our Lady of Zion. On January 12, at Struckburgh Park, Warwickshire, aged 54 **Sir George Thomas Francis Struckburgh**, ninth Bart. He entered the army, and served in the Crimean campaign of 1855. On January 13, at Church Eaton Rectory, Staffordshire, aged 79, **Rev. the Hon. Arthur Chetwynd Talbot**, son of the second Earl Talbot. On January 13, at Nice, aged 74, **Sir Edward Synge**, third Bart., of Lislee Court, co. Cork, and of Syngefield, King's County. On January 14, at Milford, Surrey, aged 68, **Francis Holl, A.R.A.**, a well-known engraver and the father of Mr. Frank Holl, R.A. On January 15, **The Right Hon. William Henry Hare Hedges-White**, Earl of Bantry, the elder surviving son of Richard, first Earl (who died in 1851), by his marriage with Lady Margaret Anne Hare, eldest daughter of William, first Earl of Listowel, born in Dublin in November 1801. He took the degree of M.A. at Downing College, Cambridge, in 1823, assumed the additional surname of Hedges by royal licence in 1840, and succeeded to the peerage as third Earl on the death of his brother in 1868. He served as High Sheriff for co. Cork in 1848, and he was also formerly lieutenant-colonel commanding the West Cork Artillery. Lord Bantry was elected a representative peer for Ireland in 1869. He married, in 1845, Jane, youngest daughter of the late Mr. Charles John Herbert, of Muckross Abbey, county Kerry, by whom he left issue three daughters, and also a son, William Henry, Viscount Berehaven, who was born in 1854, and who succeeded to the title on the death of his father. On January 16, at South Kensington, aged 84, **General Sir David Russell, K.C.B.**, son of the late Colonel James Russell, of Woodside, Stirlingshire. He entered the army, and served in the Indian Mutiny campaign; he was colonel of the 84th Regiment, and from 1868 to 1872 was in command of the South Eastern District of England. On January 18, at Huntleyburn Melrose, aged 72, **Lady Henry Kerr**, daughter of General the Hon. Sir Alexander Hope, G.C.B., and the widow of Lord Henry Francis Charles Kerr, son of the sixth Marquess of Lothian. On January 20, at the Palace, Kilmore, aged 84, **Rt. Rev. John Richard Darley**, Bishop of Kilmore, Elphin, and Ardagh. Educated at Trinity College, Dublin, he took Holy Orders, but for some time gave himself to scholastic work. In 1850 he became Rector of Drumgoon, in the diocese of Kilmore, where in 1874 he was elected bishop by the United Diocesan Synod, being the second bishop appointed under the new constitution of the Disestablished Church in Ireland. On January 21, at Ottawa, Canada, aged 62, **Alpheus Todd, LL.D., C.M.G.** Born in London, he went early to Canada, and became Librarian of the Dominion Parliament, and the author of a valuable text-book on Constitutional Law. On January 23, at Canterbury, aged 41, **Captain Richmond Griffin Nicholas**, of the 1st (King's) Dragoon Guards. Educated at Sandhurst, he entered the army in 1862, but sold out four years later. Re-enlisting as a private in the 1st Dragoon Guards, he rose to the rank of captain. In succession to his father, Major Nicholas, of the 5th Northumberland Fusiliers, he was heir to the old title, long in abeyance, of Lord-de-la-Roche, Baron of Haverfordwest. On January 23, at Great Cumberland Place, aged 78, **William Bird**, one of the first pioneers of the development of the iron trade between this country and the Continent, and an ardent free-trader. On January 24, at Lymington, Hants, aged 68, **Sir Edward Hay Drummond-Hay**. The eldest son of the late Mr. Edward William Auriol Drummond-Hay, he entered the Colonial Office in 1834, and was successively Governor of the Virgin Islands, St. Kitts, and St. Helena, retiring in 1863. On January 24, at San Remo, aged 78, **Count Guido Usedom**. He first became known as the Prussian representative at the Frankfort Diet; he was employed in various missions, and prepared the way for the Prusso-Italian Alliance, and was made a count by Prince Bismarck, and subsequently appointed Director-General of Royal Museums. On January 26, at Abbeston Hall, Pershore, aged 82, **William Laslett**. He was returned for Dorchester as a Conservative on five occasions. On January 27, at Baron-Hill, Beaumaris, aged 50, **Sir Richard Mostyn Lewis Williams-Bulkeley**, eleventh Baronet in 1875. On January 27, at Paris, aged 82, **Auguste Alexandre Dumont**, a sculptor of considerable reputation, who among many other works, designed Napoleon's statue for the column in the Place Vendôme. On January 27, at Clifton Hall, Staffordshire, aged 81, **Henry John Pye**. Was the son of the late Henry James Pye, of Faringdon, Berks, and Pinner, Middlesex, Poet Laureate, and sometime M.P. for Berks. On January 30, at Rome, aged 57, **Cardinal Bilio**, who held several offices at the Vatican, and at the last conclave obtained the next largest number of votes after the elected Pope

(Leo XIII.) On January 30, at Whitchurch, Salop, aged 84, **Admiral Francis Vere Cotton**, brother of General Sir Arthur Cotton, K.C.S.I. On January 30, at Bournemouth, aged 65, **Rev. Thomas Pownall Boulton**, LL.D., Principal of the London College of Divinity, St John's Hall, Highbury, a Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral, and the author of several books. On January 31, at Asford, aged 77, **John Henry Parker, L.B., F.S.A.** Commencing life as a bookseller, he wrote several works on architecture, and turning his attention to the Archæology of Rome, excavations were made under his direction; his works in Gothic architecture are of a very valuable description, and he was made a member of several Archæological Societies both at home and abroad.

FEBRUARY.

Abraham Hayward was the eldest son of a gentleman of Lyme Regis, in Dorsetshire; the author of a couple of works on the "Science of Horticulture" and the "Science of Agriculture," which in their day had a considerable reputation. He was born on October 31, 1802, at Wishford, in Wiltshire, and was educated at Blundell's Grammar School, Tiverton. He commenced life by being articled to a solicitor, and when he was 21 years of age was entered at the Middle Temple, being called to the Bar nine years afterwards. From the first, however, he seems to have neglected the law, so much so that when in 1845 Lord Lyndhurst gave him the silk gown, surprise was expressed at his selection; his tastes and predilections were altogether in favour of the profession of literature, though even that, possessed as he was of moderate private means, he could hardly be said to have pursued as an avocation. His first serious literary essay was a translation of Goethe's "Faust," which quickly brought him into notice, and into correspondence with Tieck, Von Chamisso, De la Motte Fouqué, and other of the poet's countrymen. Soon afterwards he wrote a monograph on Goethe, for Blackwood's "Foreign Classics." In 1861, he edited the "Letters and Literary Remains of Mr. Piozzi," and in 1864 he published a "Selection from the Diary of a Lady of Quality"—the lady of quality being the daughter of Sir Watkin Wynne, the fourth baronet of the great Welsh family. In journalism also Hayward made his mark; he brought out the *Law Magazine* in 1828, and continued to conduct it till 1844. His chief adventure in this line, however, was his connection with the *Morning Chronicle*, which in 1848 was purchased by some of the prominent Peelites, and converted into an organ for the advocacy of the principles of that party. The conduct of this

paper was committed to Mr. Douglas Cooke, afterwards the editor of the *Saturday Review*; and among the principal contributors were George Smythe, afterwards Viscount Strangford, Goldwin Smith, and Abraham Hayward. The paper was extremely clever, and delighted its readers by attacking every one all round; but after living through the troublesome times that succeeded the downfall of Louis Philippe, it became unpopular, and at the close of the Crimean war passed into other hands. As a commercial venture the *Morning Chronicle* of that day was most successful; Sidney Herbert is said to have made 116,000*l.* by it, the Duke of Newcastle 16,000*l.*, and others considerable sums. It is, however, to his ability as critic and essay writer that Mr. Hayward owes his celebrity; his great literary reputation will rest on the essays and articles which appeared in the *Edinburgh* and other Reviews, the best of which were republished under his own careful supervision by Messrs. Longman and Mr. Murray. He was all his life a constant contributor to the highest order of periodical literature, and towards the end of it there was scarcely a number of the *Quarterly Review* which did not contain an article from his pen. An extraordinarily wide range of reading, a wonderful memory, and a large personal acquaintance in the best society, gave him unusual facilities for reviewing with effect any books on contemporary history or biography. The same qualities which made his biographical articles so popular, contributed in no small degree to his social successes. Although he came to town from the country an unknown man, he soon held a recognised position in the highest intellectual and aristocratic circles of the metropolis, and yet he cannot be considered in any way as a parasite, nor can it be said of him that he was a mere *racomléur*; on the

contrary, as he himself wrote in his essay on Samuel Rogers, "the privilege of mingling in daily and familiar intercourse with the most eminent men and women of the age is a proud and enviable one." He was a welcome acquisition in almost every *salon*, and a guest who was an addition to any dinner-table. He could talk well and originally on any subject, and his wealth of anecdote, accompanied by considerable dramatic power, was a source of amusement and enjoyment to all who knew him. Of course he made enemies as well as friends; when, as before referred to, he was made a Q.C., his Inn refused to make him a bencher, and this was attributed to the personal animosity of Mr. Roebuck. Again, he was nominated to a post in connection with the Poor Law Board, with easy duties and a handsome salary, but a cry was raised against the appointment, and Hayward was condemned to forego his hopes. No doubt he was never in actual need of money, for he had some private property, his wants were comparatively few, and his expenses not very great; but a comfortable official income would have been a boon which he could have thoroughly appreciated. If he had found it necessary he could have largely added to his income by increased literary exertion. In early life he professed Tory politics, and once sought a seat in Parliament. He was a member of the Carlton, but latterly became more and more of a Liberal, and then withdrew his name from that club. Mr. Hayward was never married; he died at his chambers in St. James's Street, on February 2, in the eighty-second year of his age.

M. Rouher.—Eugène Rouher, probably the most prominent statesman, certainly the most powerful Minister of the second French Empire, was born on November 30, 1814, at Riom, a small town in the Puy de Dôme, and formerly the capital of the old Duchy of Auvergne, where his father, Jules Rouher, held a position as *juge de paix*. Young Eugène received his early education at the *Lyce* of his native town, and when he was 16 went to Montpellier to study law; he proceeded in due course to Paris, where he passed his examination, and obtained his diploma in 1835. At Paris, he was distinguished for his thrift and industry, but proved to be a plodding rather than a brilliant student; perceiving that he would be at a disadvantage in competition with his many quicker class-fellows, who could both outshine and outtalk him, he gave up all idea of settling in the

capital, and determined to practise his profession at Riom, which, though a very small town, is the seat of a Court of Appeal and a Tribunal of First Instance. Here he succeeded well for a young barrister. Blessed with a tenacious memory, he was able to quote on any occasion almost all the articles of the Code; this gave him assurance, and although he maintained the careful habits which he had shown in Paris, lived at home with his parents, and did not frequent the *cafés*, as most Frenchmen do, he was reckoned a good and obliging fellow by his colleagues at the Bar.

The first step in the advance of Rouher's fortunes came with his marriage; in his thirtieth year he married a daughter of M. Conchon, a judge at Riom, who had been Mayor of Clermont, and afterwards became a Councillor of the Court of Appeal in Paris.

Madame Rouher was young, lovely, and gifted, and in maturer years attracted notice as one of the beauties of the Court of Louis Napoléon. Previous to his marriage, M. Rouher had been counted as a Liberal; he belonged to the Liberal Club in the town, and was generally retained to defend the journalists of that party, who were always getting into trouble. Soon after M. Conchon's appointment to the bench, however, a sudden change came over the political opinions of his son-in-law, which was consummated in 1846 by Rouher's becoming a candidate for Riom in the Conservative interest, with all the administrative support of the Guizot Ministry to back him. This, of course, was the signal for the complete rupture of political relations with his former friends. Though not successful on this occasion, he was at once accepted as a leader by the Conservatives of Riom, and at the first general election held after the revolution of 1848, was returned to the Constituent Assembly by the Puy de Dôme. In the following year, the Constituent Assembly having dissolved itself, he was re-elected to the Legislative Chamber, and immediately afterwards, on Louis Napoléon's becoming President of the Republic, was made by him Prime Minister, with the title of Minister of Justice and Keeper of the Seals.

This appointment of Mr. Rouher, for whom Mr. Odilon Barrot had given way, was thought at the time to be rather a good joke, and his Ministry was generally accepted as a mere stop-gap, for all the members were not more known than their leader. Rouher him-

self felt the difficulty of the situation; he understood that a false step must cause a fall from which no rise was possible. He accordingly conducted himself as wisely and cautiously as when as a student he kept aloof from the gaieties of student life in Paris, and as an advocate from the *cafés* and barsuppers of his native town. With all his experience to get, he applied himself closely to acquiring a mastery over the details of his department, at the same time paying careful attention to the wishes and directions of the President, whose power and abilities he was probably one of the few at that time to understand. Louis Napoléon, never slow in attaching to himself men who had the ability and will to serve him, and who would consent to carry out his directions without insisting on knowing or pretending to see the reasons for them, very speedily perceived the use to which Rouher's subservient nature might be turned, and to him was entrusted the drawing up of the Constitution which, after the *Coup d'État* of December, 2, 1851, laid France bound hand and foot at the mercy of the Emperor. For putting the affair into action, however, a more daring nature than that of the provincial barrister was required; on October 26, the Rouher Ministry was dismissed, and was reconstituted under General Arnaud, who, however, was the only member of the new Cabinet who knew what was going to be done. The real conspirators against the liberties of the French, the men to whom the projects of the future Emperor were alone entrusted (of whom, no doubt, Rouher was one), formed a small inner circle, to whom Louis Napoléon had given the most brilliant and solid inducements to share his fortunes. This was evident when it was seen how men like de Morny, de Persigny, Walewski, prospered under the Empire; for them it was only to ask and it was given unto them. To do him justice, Rouher bore the wealth and honours which were showered on the Emperor's new creatures better than others who perhaps were less deserving of them. The Revolution of 1870 left him as the Empire had found him—plain M. Rouher; and although he was accused of being unscrupulous, no one charged him with being dishonest.

The *Coup d'État* was accomplished on December 2, 1851, and just a year afterwards the head of the Government was transformed from the President of the Republic to the Emperor of the French. Then M. Rouher got his re-

ward. He re-entered the Imperial service as Vice-President of the Council of State, thus becoming virtually the custodian of the constitution which he himself had framed and which the nation solemnly accepted by a *plébiscite* ratifying the *Coup d'État*. His salary as Minister was 4,000*l.* a year, and he lived in a palace furnished, warmed, and lighted at the expense of the State. Besides this he received from the Emperor 40,000*l.* in money and the estate of Cirez, near Brunet. Rouher kept his post in the Council of State until 1855, when he became Minister of Commerce and Public Works. In this position he had to provide enormous sums of money which the Emperor and his *Édile*, Baron Haussmann, required for the embellishment, or as it may be said the rebuilding, of Paris, besides other improvements and undertakings all over the country. To him also was entrusted the important business of preparing the treaty of commerce with England, the necessary arrangements and details of which he worked out with great industry and completeness. Unfortunately the doctrines of free trade have never been popular in France, and the negotiations had to be kept secret until an agreement had been arrived at; when in 1860 the draft of the treaty was published, the negotiations with this country had reached such a point that the Imperial Government stood pledged and the nation could only acquiesce. Able and energetic as Rouher showed himself in carrying out the duties of his office, he cannot be said to have been during this period popular with his colleagues; he cared for influence and power more than for money, and would not put himself on the same level with his fellow-ministers, who were as ready to beg for more as they were eager to squander what they had already extorted from the fears or gratitude of the Emperor. Rouher, on the other hand, was not a spendthrift, and knew how to keep his recreations from trenching on the serious business of life. The Emperor liked him for his pliancy, for the readiness with which he always fell in with his views and the zeal he showed in carrying them out, but generally he was considered to have a crabbed temper, presenting in this respect a strong contrast to the other Ministers, and it was understood that he was no great favourite with the Empress.

In 1863, the Imperial Government suffered a blow through the death of

M. Billault, who had been its spokesman in the two chambers, and M. Rouher was appointed to be Minister of State in his place. During the first eleven years of the Empire, the opposition in the Corps Législatif consisted of five members only, but at the general election of 1863 opposition candidates were elected in all the nine constituencies of Paris and in fourteen other places. In addition therefore to his inferiority to his predecessor as an orator, Rouher had to contend with an increased minority in the Chamber, of which such men as Thiers, Berryer, and Jules Favre were the leaders. Of course the votes of the Government majority, and a judicious, though pretty constant use of the *clôture*, secured the Minister the ultimate victory, but in the contest of mere tongues he was generally worsted, and what was worse, he failed to arouse the sympathy of the nation. From the time he was set up as the mouthpiece of the Cabinet it became evident to the Emperor that new reforms must be granted, and in 1867 a first instalment of these was promised, in a manifesto which was tantamount to a charter, restoring Parliamentary institutions. To carry out these reforms it was arranged, chiefly at the instigation of the Empress, with whom M. Rouher had now ingratiated himself, that M. Emile Ollivier should be called to power at the head of a Liberal Cabinet. The objects of the Emperor, or rather of the Empress, who had become a distinct factor in the councils of the State, in making these changes are perhaps difficult to understand. Probably the hope was that the Liberal Cabinet should not remain in office long; it could then be arranged that M. Rouher should come back to power, but as the elect of a popular Parliamentary majority, not as the nominee of the Emperor. M. Ollivier's Ministry was gazetted on January 2, 1870, and M. Rouher was appointed President of the Senate, but the latter remained the occult Premier, and when shortly afterwards the quarrel arose with Prussia it was to his advice no less than to the warlike aspirations of the Empress that the disastrous campaign against Germany was due. This led to the catastrophe of Sedan and the downfall of the Empire; on September 4 the Minister who was flying to join his mistress in England, was recognised by some fisherwomen at Boulogne, mobbed, pelted with fish, loaded with imprecations as the author of the country's disasters, and only rescued with bleeding face and torn

hair from the hands of his assailants by the gendarmes.

From this time until his death Rouher's work was that of the representative of the fallen Empire in France and the agent there of the Imperial family. Round him there gathered all those who adhered to the politics of Louis Napoléon, and who occupied themselves in plotting his restoration to power. A constituency in Corsica, the island which has always been faithful to the name of Buonaparte, was found only too willing to send him as their deputy to the National Assembly, and there for seven long years he had to bear the brunt of attacks of all parties who held him responsible for the failures of the Imperial policy, the debt of 200,000,000*fr.* as indemnity to Germany, the destruction of the French army, and not least, the loss of prestige which caused France to play but a secondary rôle in Europe. He took a house in the Rue de l'Elysée, which became the headquarters of the Buonapartist party, and whence, by means of subsidies to the provincial newspapers, the distribution of photographs and tracts, pamphlets and popular almanacs, a ceaseless propaganda in aid of the ex-dynasty was carried on. At the death of the Emperor in 1876, M. Rouher continued to maintain the same agitation in favour of the Prince Imperial, and it was not until the latter fell in Zululand, in a cause not his own, that he may be said to have thrown up the sponge. The ex-Minister was at Cirez when the news of this calamity was conveyed to him by telegram from Chislehurst, and it completely staggered him. He was never the same man afterwards; the struggle he had so bravely and faithfully maintained for ten years was hopeless; there was nothing left for him but to sicken and die. In the summer of 1883 he had a paralytic stroke, after which his mind gave way, and he died on February 3. With his death closed the final chapter in the history of the Second Empire.

Sir J. Barnard Byles.—The Right Hon. Sir John Barnard Byles, who died on February 3 at his residence, Harefield House, near Uxbridge, was born at Stowmarket, in Suffolk, in 1801. He was the eldest son of Mr. John Byles of that place, by the only daughter of Mr. William Barnard of Holts, in Essex. He was called to the Bar by the Hon. Society of the Inner Temple in 1831, went the Norfolk Circuit and attended quarter sessions. When he was called

to the Bar, he was already thirty years of age, so that he spent a considerable time in preparation, but after that event his rise was rapid. Soon afterwards he published his celebrated treatise on Bills of Exchange, which has made his name famous all over the world, where English is spoken. This book "Byles on Bills," as it is familiarly and alliteratively called, has reached thirteen editions in England and six in the United States, and was accepted until lately as an unrivalled text-book; almost every point which could arise upon Bills of Exchange had been decided, and the decision was found recorded therein. Now, however, that telegraphic cables have facilitated and altered the means of conducting commercial business, the work threatens to become obsolete. In 1840 Mr. Byles was appointed Recorder of Birmingham, and in 1843 he assumed the coil. At that time the Serjeants-at-Law had an exclusive right of audience in the Court of Common Pleas, and were privileged to deal with certain suits relating to land, but three years afterwards an Act was passed which opened the Court of Common Pleas to all barristers. In compensation for the loss of his special rights of audience in the Common Pleas, Serjeant Byles received a patent of precedence in all the courts; this patent is practically equivalent to the rank of Queen's Counsel, with the advantage that its possessor is not fettered by any oath, nor regarded as an officer of the Crown. After fourteen years' successful practice as an advocate in leading principally commercial business, of which he secured a preponderating share, Sir J. Byles attained in 1857 the dignity of Queen's Serjeant, and next year was raised to the bench as a puisne judge in his old Court of the Common Pleas, in succession to Mr. Justice Cresswell, who went to the Divorce Court. As a politician Sir John Byles was an ardent Tory and protectionist, and in that capacity had published a pamphlet entitled the "Sophisms of Free Trade," but his political predilections seemed to have been no bar to his advancement under a Liberal Minister, who probably deemed that a good judge must be independent of the claims of party. For fifteen years Sir J. Byles discharged his duties on the bench, and in 1873 he resigned his seat at the Common Pleas, having served long enough to be able to claim a pension. On leaving the bench, he was made a Privy Councillor, and afterwards he sometimes sat in Downing Street on

the Judicial Committee. In his latter years he gave much of his leisure to theological study, and in 1875 he published a work on "The Foundation of Religion in the Mind and Heart of Man." Besides the publications which have been mentioned, he was the author of a treatise on the "Usury Laws and the Effect of the Recent Alterations," which was published in 1845.

Wendell Phillips.—The celebrated Abolitionist was born at Boston in the United States of America in 1811; his father was the first mayor elected by that city. When he was twenty years of age he took his degree at Harvard, and thence he proceeded to the Cambridge Law School, where he passed through the usual course for practising at the Bar. The question of the slave trade, which, so far as England was concerned, had been decided by the well-known Bill of 1833, was at this time coming into prominence in the United States, and led to a series of riots, which culminated in the year 1835 at Boston, where Phillips was then residing with his family. The leader of the anti-slavery party was William Lloyd Garrison, with whose zeal and earnestness Wendell Phillips was much struck; a couple of years afterwards he threw in his lot with the Abolitionists, and became one of their most eloquent and energetic advocates. He adopted at once the view that the only way to effect the emancipation of the slaves was by dissolving the Union, and as he could not conscientiously take an oath to the Union, which he held to be an immoral compact between freedom and slavery, he felt himself compelled to withdraw his name from the Bar. For more than twenty years he devoted himself to the work of denouncing on platforms and in lecture-rooms, the iniquity of keeping human beings in a state of bondage, and his oratory contributed more perhaps than any other circumstance to awaken public opinion in the Northern States on the subject. His strong feeling on the questions of slavery, and the Union, even after the conclusion of the Civil War, led him to oppose resolutely and bitterly all conciliation with the States which had fought in support of their pretension to preserve their property in negroes. For this course he opposed the dissolution of the Anti-Slavery Society, which Lloyd Garrison had founded, and on the retirement of the latter he accepted the post of president. This association was broken up in 1870, and Phillips then

devoted his energies to the furtherance of other causes, which had already engaged his attention and possessed his sympathies. Prominent among these were the questions of women's rights and of temperance. He advocated also strongly the mitigation of criminal punishment, but although he spoke frequently on each and all of these subjects, he never succeeded in attracting the same interest to them as he had to the great topic of obtaining the manumission of the negroes. As one of the foremost and probably the most eloquent of the small band of men who laboured for so long in the cause of the emancipation of the slaves, Wendell Phillips will never be forgotten in the United States. He died at his residence in Boston on February 3, after a short illness, having just completed his seventy-second year.

Earl of Abingdon.—The Right Hon. Montagu Bertie, Earl of Abingdon, and Baron Norreys of Rycote, Oxon, in the Peerage of England, whose death took place on February 8, at 18 Grosvenor Street, London, was the eldest son of Montagu, fifth Earl, by his wife Emily, daughter of General Hon. Thomas Gage. He was born in 1808, and educated at Eton, and Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took the degree of M.A. in 1829. The hon. degree of D.C.L. of Oxford was conferred upon him in 1834. He represented Oxfordshire in the House of Commons from 1832 to 1852, and Abingdon till he succeeded to the peerage on his father's death in 1854. In 1835 he married Elizabeth Lavinia, only child of the late Mr. George Granville Vernon-Harcourt. He was Lord-Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of Berks from 1854 till 1881, when a paralytic attack obliged him to resign. He was also High Steward of Oxford and Abingdon.

Thomas Chenery.—Mr. Chenery, who was for some time the editor of the *Times*, was born in 1826, in Barbados. When he was ten years old he came to this country, and was put to a private school, whence, after two or three years, he went to Eton. On leaving Eton he paid a visit to the West Indies, and also acted as tutor to one or two young noblemen; eventually he entered at Caius College, Cambridge, and graduated in 1853, taking his place as fourth in the second class of the Classical Tripos of that year. At the conclusion of his University course, he studied law, and was called to the Bar, soon after which he was offered, and accepted, the

post of correspondent of the *Times* at Constantinople. This engagement decided the course of Mr. Chenery's life, for the connection he thus formed with the leading journal only ceased with his death; it also influenced his subsequent career in another way, for during his stay at Constantinople, which lasted for more than two years, that city was the scene of remarkable events in the world's history, and many men of note were attracted thither by its propinquity to the seat of war in the Crimea. Chenery lived much with the leaders of the Greek community in the Turkish capital, and this, combined with his marvellous facility in acquiring foreign languages, served to increase his taste for Oriental studies, which were to form the chief pleasure of his life, and to stimulate his bias in favour of the philology of the East, to which much of his subsequent fame is due. After a short time spent at the front in the Crimea, where he was ordered to replace Dr. W. H. Russell as special correspondent of the *Times*, and on the conclusion of the war, Mr. Chenery returned to London, where he occupied himself with the study of Arabic; the first fruit of his studies was the translation of the "Assemblies of Al Hariri," published in 1867, the success of which work led to his appointment to the Lord Almoner's Professorship of Arabic at Oxford. In 1872, Mr. Chenery also published an edition of the "Maceroth Ithiel," a Hebrew work written in imitation of the "Assemblies of Al Hariri," and his introduction to this work, written in Hebrew, gave proof of his proficiency in that language, and was highly praised by all its scholars, Christians as well as Jews. These, however, were only the relaxations of his leisure; for twenty years after his return from the Crimea he was employed on the staff of the *Times*, as a regular contributor of leading articles, reviews, and other original papers. This employment was continuous from the date of his return to England until he became the editor, so that it may be said from the time when he left the University up to his death his life was devoted to the service of that newspaper. He had an excellent style, abundant knowledge, great facility, and singular capacity for taking pains, and Mr. Delane, the then editor, learned to look upon him as one of the most able of his assistants. On the retirement of Mr. Delane in 1877, the editorship was offered to Mr. Chenery, and after some hesitation accepted, though contrary to

the advice of many of his old friends, who were afraid that the tremendous wear and tear involved in directing the great daily journal would prove too great a strain on his energies. This, indeed, proved to be the case; when he accepted the office, Mr. Delane's illness had thrown the staff into some confusion, and the exceedingly critical state of public affairs added to the anxieties of the new editor. Then, though Mr. Chenery was in some respects singularly qualified for his post, he unfortunately did not possess the physical strength necessary to a successful editor. Besides, his extreme conscientiousness made him feel acutely the great responsibilities of his situation, and his sensitive nature was ill-fitted to endure hostile criticism. Already, in 1879, it became evident to his friends that his bodily powers were beginning to give way before the terrible strain of constant work. His great conscientiousness and patient courage, however, led him to toil on while strength remained, but on the 1st of February, 1884, he was forced to *leave his desk and take to his bed*, and a few days afterwards he was taken to his rest, so that he may be said to have died at his post. His death took place at his house in Serjeants' Inn, on February 12.

Dr. Hullah.—John Pyke Hullah, the celebrated composer and teacher of music, was born at Worcester June 27, 1813. He was brought by his parents to London while he was yet an infant, and received his early education at a school at Highgate. He was first a pupil of William Horsley, the celebrated glee writer, and in 1832 entered as a student of the Royal Academy, to study singing under Crivelli. His first important musical production was the opera "The Village Coquettes," the book of which was written by Charles Dickens. It was produced at the St. James's Theatre, then under the management of John Braham, on December 5, 1836. "The Barber of Basora" (November 11, 1837) and "The Outpost" (May 17, 1838) were brought out at Covent Garden with sufficient success to justify him in pursuing his career as a dramatic composer with a fair prospect. In 1840 he went to Paris to study the system inaugurated by Guillaume Louis Bocquillon Wilhem, the founder of popular musical education and of the important "Orphéon" movement in France. The principles of Wilhem's method are contained in his "Guide de la méthode élémentaire

et analytique de musique et de chant," and the same principles Mr. Hullah forthwith proceeded to adapt to English uses. Having made some improvements upon the method of Wilhem, he undertook to teach class singing at the newly established training college at Battersea. The first lesson was given on February 10, 1840, and thus initiated the movement which was afterwards spread throughout the kingdom. The event was regarded with so much importance that the roadway to the college was lined with the carriages of the nobility and gentry, who came to hear the lessons, all interested in the matter. Dr. Hullah afterwards often said that so diffident and nervous was he about the result that he walked away from the college gate three times before he could summon up courage to ring the bell and present himself to conduct the first lesson. In February of the following year, 1841, he opened a school at Exeter Hall for the instruction of schoolmasters and acting teachers in his system. To these classes not only schoolmasters but country professors and the general public flocked to learn and obtain certificates to qualify them to teach. It is estimated that upwards of 25,000 persons passed through his classes between 1840 and 1860. Out of the classes an upper and lower school were formed, and with the former Dr. Hullah gave a series of concerts with the help of the leading professional vocalists and a full orchestra, illustrating the rise and progress of vocal music in chronological sequence. In 1847 his friends built St. Martin's Hall in Long Acre for him, and here until 1860, when the hall was burned down, he continued to give a series of concerts, at which many of the most famous artistes of the day earned their reputation. He became professor of music at some of the most important schools in London, including King's College, Queen's College, and, after the decease of William Horsley in 1858, Charterhouse, and in 1874 he was appointed inspector of training schools for the United Kingdom, a position which he resigned in 1882, being succeeded by Dr. Stainer. Mr. Hullah was a firm believer in his own method, and strongly opposed to the so-called "Tonic Sol-fa" system, which of late years has found a vast number of adherents among popular teachers, and the practical results of which cannot at least be denied, whatever be thought of its scientific merits. In 1876 the University of Edinburgh made him an

honorary LL.D., and in the following year he was elected a member of the Society of St. Cecilia in Rome, the most ancient musical academy in Italy. As a composer, Dr. Hullah was a graceful rather than a powerful writer. There is some very charming music in his concerted pieces, and he has enriched English musical literature with at least one ballad, which is not likely to be forgotten. This is the pathetic setting of Kingsley's "Three Fishers," by far the best of his numerous songs. He was a prolific author and editor of musical works. His great collections, "Part Music for Four Voices" and "Vocal Scores," contain a great deal of valuable material, and his educational works, "A Grammar of Harmony," "A Grammar of Vocal Music," and others, are still in use. Of more general interest was "The History of Modern Music," published in 1862, and supplemented three years later by an additional volume entitled "The Third or Transition Period of Musical History." Both volumes are composed of lectures delivered at the Royal Institution, and are remarkable for their pleasant style rather than for deep learning or systematic arrangement. Considering, however, the great dearth of similar works in English, they are not without a certain value. In addition to this Mr. Hullah was a frequent contributor to periodical literature, and for some time acted as musical critic of the *Academy* and other publications. In that capacity he staunchly upheld the forms established by the classical masters; with the more recent developments of modern music he felt little sympathy. Towards the close of his life, owing to failing health, he lived much in retirement, but at one time he was a conspicuous figure in London society, and enjoyed the reputation of being a man of genial temper, wide reading, and an admirable talker on literary as well as musical subjects. He died at his residence, Grosvenor Mansions, February 21, aged 71.

The Right Hon. Thomas Milner Gibson.—Thomas Milner Gibson was born in Trinidad in 1807. He was educated at Charterhouse School, and was among the list of Wranglers at Cambridge in 1830. He was returned in 1837 as member for Ipswich in the Conservative interest, but two years later resigned, after becoming a convert to the Liberal doctrines of the period. He appealed to the electors to receive him in his new capacity, but was defeated at

the poll, and remained for four years out of the House. Like many another clever and ambitious young man, he found in Free Trade and its development the cardinal point of his political creed. In the interval of his exclusion from Parliamentary life, while the agitation was being organised for the abolition of the Corn Laws, Mr. Gibson entered heart and soul into the movement, and became one of the prominent orators of the League. This gave him his seat for Manchester, which he won in 1841, after a severe struggle with Sir George Murray. He was a private member for no more than five years, for on the formation, in July 1846, of Lord John Russell's Ministry, the Prime Minister, with the object of carrying out his Free Trade policy to its logical results, appointed him Vice-President of the Board of Trade.

It need hardly be said that just after the close of the agitation and the success of the League the now subordinate office of Vice-President of the Board of Trade was a post of exceptional importance, especially when, as in Mr. Gibson's case, the chief of the Board, the Earl of Clarendon, sat not in the Commons, but in the Lords. The object of Lord John Russell was to strengthen his Government by an alliance with the chiefs of the League, and he made no error of judgment in choosing Mr. Gibson to be the mouthpiece of the Board in the House and the channel through which effect was given to its new policy. Mr. Gibson, though he held office for only two years, will always be remembered as one of the first official exponents of Free Trade. Eleven years afterwards he lost his seat for Manchester, his peace-at-any-price opinions having proved distasteful to constituents excited by the Crimean War, but soon afterwards he found refuge at Ashton-under-Lyne, which he continued to represent till 1868, when he wholly retired from public life. During Lord Palmerston's Ministry, and in the short-lived Government of Earl Russell that followed, Mr. Gibson was President of the Board of Trade, with cabinet rank. Among his public labours, his zealous and successful work in connection with the removal of "The Taxes on Knowledge" call for grateful recognition. The abolition of the newspaper stamp, the advertisement duty, and the excise on paper were his latest achievements, and were recognised by a testimonial which was presented to him in 1861 by his admirers. The mere fact that the changes largely brought about by Mr. Gibson's means

made penny newspapers for the first time possible will show the importance of the measures with which his name

will be associated. He died on board his yacht *Resolute* at Algiers on February 25.

The following deaths also occurred during the month of February:—On February 3, at Clairville Grove, s.w., **John Fraser Corkran**, who was at one time Paris Correspondent to the *Morning Herald*, and was contributor to many periodicals. He began life as a dramatic writer in Dublin, was the author of a History of the French Constituent Assembly, a few plays and novels, and he was also a contributor to several of the magazines. On February 4, at Laverstock Salisbury, aged 77, **Lord Edward Thynne**, sixth son of second Marquess of Bath; educated at Oriel College, Oxford; represented Frome from May 1854 to July 1863. He married, first, Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Mrs. Mellish of Woodford, Essex, and, secondly, Cecilia Anne Mary, only daughter of Mrs. Gore the novelist. On February 4, in the Albany, aged 62, **Lieutenant-General Augustus Frederick Steele**. He entered the army in 1841, served in China, and in the 9th Lancers under Lord Clyde, during the relief of Lucknow in 1857. For his services in connection with this expedition he was made lieutenant-colonel. He became a colonel in 1867, major-general in 1877, and general in 1881. On February 4, at Tokar, **James Anderson Morice Bey**, the son of the late George Farquhar Morice, R.N. and the brother of Morice Pasha. He was for some years Inspector-General of the Coastguard in Alexandria. On February 4, aged 55, **Lieutenant-General Nathaniel Octavius Simpson Turner, C.B.** Entered the Royal Artillery in 1847, and served in the Crimean campaign, and afterwards in India. On February 8, at Therapia, aged 61, **Frank Ives Scudamore, C.B.** He was appointed in 1860 second Secretary of the General Post Office, and retained this office till 1875. He took an important part in the transfer of the telegraphs to the Government. On his retirement in 1875 he went to Constantinople, and acted as superintendent of the Post Office for some time. He projected many useful improvements, but found himself unable to put them into practice, owing to obstacles placed in his way by the Turkish authorities. He was a facile writer of *Vers de Société*, and the author of many brilliant articles in numerous public journals. On February 8, at Brighton, aged 73, **Sir Edward Mortimer Archibald, K.C.M.G., C.B.** He was for many years Her Majesty's Consul-General at New York. On February 10, at Dublin, aged 89, **Dowager Lady Dunally**, the daughter of the first Viscount Hawarden, and married, in 1826, Henry, the second Lord Dunally, a representative Peer of Ireland, who died in 1854. On February 11, at Princeton, N.J., aged 76, **Professor Arnold Henry Guyot**, a distinguished American geographer. Born at Neuchâtel, Switzerland, he was for some years a professor in the Academy there, but removed to the United States, and subsequently became Professor of Physical Geography at the College of New Jersey at Princeton. On February 11, at Edinburgh, **John Hutton Balfour, M.D.** Born in 1808, he was educated at the University of Edinburgh, where he became Professor of Botany in 1845, after having filled the corresponding chair at the University of Glasgow for four years previously, Regius Keeper of the Royal Botanic Garden, and Queen's Botanist for Scotland. He was the author of a popular manual of Botany, and of "Botany and Religion," and numerous other works. On February 13, at Moorhill, Sheddfield, Hants, aged 79, **Sir James Sabine Pasley, K.C.B.**, of the Craig, Bowness. The son of Major John Sabine, he succeeded his maternal grandfather, Admiral Sir Thomas Pasley, K.C.B., as second Baronet, whose name he assumed. He served with distinction in the Crimean campaign. On February 13, at Lexington, Virginia, aged 70, **Ex-Governor Letscher**, who held the post of Governor of Virginia when the State passed the ordinance to secede from the Union. On February 13, aged 58, **Dr. John F. G. Schmidt**, a well-known European astronomer, and the director of the observatory at Athens. On February 13, aged 71, **Dr. Aaron Bernstein**, who was originally designed for the Rabbinical career, but who subsequently became one of the most advanced freethinkers and publicists of Germany. On February 14, at South Kensington, aged 81, **Admiral Charles Ramsay Drinkwater Bethune, C.B.**, of Balfour, Fifeshire. The son of Colonel John Drinkwater, C.B., F.S.A., he was born in 1802, and he assumed the name of Bethune in 1837. He entered the Navy, and became captain in 1830, and served with distinction in China, and was present at the capture of Canton in 1841. He was a Fellow of the Geographical and Astronomical Societies, and a magistrate and deputy-lieutenant for Fife. On February 16, at Eaton Place, aged 54, **Vice-Admiral Henry Carr Glyn, C.B., C.S.I.** Son of the first Lord Wolverton, he entered the Navy in 1844, and served on the Pacific and China stations, and

with the Naval Brigade in the Crimea. After commanding the *Serapis*, conveying the Prince of Wales to India, he held the command of the Channel Squadron. On February 16, aged 63, **Count Theodore de Mouncel**, an eminent French electrician. On February 16, at Newhaven, Connecticut, aged 71, **Dr. S. Wells Williams**. After many years spent in China, where he was printer to the American Board of Foreign Missions, and where he acquired an unrivalled knowledge of the Chinese language, he was appointed lecturer of Chinese at Yale College. On February 17, at Devonshire Terrace, Hyde Park, aged 50, **Charles Stuart Calverley**, Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, a well-known writer of verses of a humorous classical kind; the son of the Rev. Henry Blaydes, afterwards Calverley, vicar of South Stoke, Somerset. He was called to the Bar at the Inner Temple in 1865, and joined the Midland Circuit. His best-known works are the "Verses and Translations" and "Fly Leaves." On February 18, at Petcorthie, aged 76, **Major-General Philip Anstruther, C.B.**, of Thirlport, Fifeshire. Son of Sir Alexander Anstruther of Thirlport, he entered the East India Company's service in 1823, and served with distinction in China, Afghanistan, and Burmah, retiring as major-general in 1858. On February 22, aged 67, **Sir Charles Sladen, K.C.B.**, member of the Legislative Council of Victoria. The son of the late Mr. John Baker Sladen of Ripple Court, Kent, he practised as an attorney in Geelong, where he afterwards became Colonial Secretary. As a member of the Upper House, he led the Chamber through various constitutional struggles, and once formed a Ministry. On February 24, at Versailles, aged 65, **General Borel**, formerly Minister at War. He served in the Crimea and in Lombardy, and was at the head of General de Cissey's staff in 1870. On February 24, aged 64, **M. Benjamin Ulmann**; an Austrian painter whose finest pictures adorn the Paris Law Courts. On February 24, at Penrhos, Holyhead, aged 82, **Hon. William Owen Stanley**. Son of the first Lord Stanley of Alderley, he sat in Parliament for Anglesea, Chester, and Beaumaris until 1874. He was appointed Lord Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum for Anglesea in 1869. On February 25, at Paris, aged 94, **General Schramm**, the "father" of the French Army. The son of a general of division, to whom he was aide-de-camp, he served in all Napoleon's wars, particularly distinguishing himself at the battle of Lützen, until taken prisoner by the Austrians. On his release he held a command during the Hundred Days. In later life he served in Belgium and in Algeria, was raised to the House of Peers, became Minister of War in 1850, and a senator under the Empire. On February 28, at Rome, aged 79, **Charles Plowden**, the head of the well-known banking-house of Plowden & Co., the first English bank established in Rome. The title of Count was conferred on Mr. Plowden by the Grand Duke of Tuscany, for the able co-operation he had rendered in carrying out public works. On February 28, at Hyndford, North Berwick, **Captain Grant Suttie, R.N.** The son of the late Sir George Grant Suttie, he was acting lieutenant of the *Bellerophon* during the Russian War in the Black Sea.

MARCH.

Earl of Sandwich.—The Right Hon. John William Montagu, Earl of Sandwich, Kent, Viscount Hinchinbrook, and Baron Montagu, of St. Neots, Huntingdonshire, in the Peerage of England, was the only son of George John, sixth Earl, by marriage with Lady Louisa Mary Corry, daughter of Armar, first Earl of Belmore, and was born in Grafton Street, London, on November 8, 1811. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, and had held the title since the reign of George III., having succeeded to the family honours on the death of his father, as far back as 1818. He was appointed Lord Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of the county of Huntingdon in 1841, and be-

came Colonel of the Huntingdonshire Militia in 1852. He was Captain of the Hon. Corps of Gentlemen-at-Arms from February to December 1852, in which year he was sworn a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council. From February 1858 till June in the following year he held the Mastership of the Queen's Buckhounds, a post for which his taste for field sports admirably fitted him. Lord Sandwich was an aide-de-camp to the Queen, and formerly held a lieutenant's commission in the Grenadier Guards. Lord Sandwich was twice married—first, in 1838, to Lady Mary Paget, seventh daughter of Henry William, first Marquess of Anglesey, K.G., which lady died

in 1859; and secondly, in 1865, to Lady Blanche Egerton, youngest daughter of Francis, first Earl of Ellesmere. He died at his residence, Grosvenor Square, March 3.

Baroness North.—The Right Hon. Susan (in her own right) Baroness North, of Kirtling, Cambridgeshire, in the Peerage of England, was the last surviving child of George Augustus, third Earl of Guilford, and ninth Baron North, and was born on February 6, 1797, her mother being his lordship's second wife, Susan, daughter of the late Mr. Thomas Coutts, banker, of London, grandfather of Lady Burdett-Coutts. The Earl of Guilford died in 1802, having had issue (besides four sons, who all died in infancy), three daughters, between the two survivors of whom the Barony of North, created by writ of summons in 1554, was declared by the House of Lords, in 1837, to be in abeyance; this was terminated in 1841, on the death of Lady Maria, Marchioness of Bute, half-sister of Lady North. In 1835 Lady North married Colonel John Sidney Doyle, who assumed the surname of North in 1838, now M.P. for Oxfordshire, and by whom she left issue the Hon. William Henry John, late of the 1st Life Guards, to whom the barony descended.

Viscount Falkland.—The Right Hon. Lucius Bentinck Cary, Viscount Falkland in the Peerage of Scotland, and Baron Hunsdon, of Scutterskelke, Yorkshire, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom, G.C.H., was the eldest son of Charles John, ninth Viscount, a captain in the Royal Navy, who was mortally wounded in a duel by Mr. A. Powell, in 1809, and died two days afterwards. He became a Lord of the Bedchamber to William IV. in 1830. He was a representative peer for Scotland in 1831-2, when he was raised to the Peerage of the United Kingdom. He was a Lord-in-Waiting to the Queen from 1837 to 1839, and was then appointed a Lord of the Bedchamber. From 1840 till 1846 he held the post of Governor of Nova Scotia. He was captain of the Yeomen of the Guard from 1846 till 1848, when he was nominated to the Governorship of Bombay, from which post he retired in 1853. His ancestor, Sir Henry Cary, the first Viscount Falkland, was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland for seven years, and his successor was the celebrated cavalier, Viscount Falkland, who fell at the battle of Newbury. The late Lord

Falkland was nominated a Knight Grand Cross of the Royal Hanoverian Guelphic Order in 1831, and sworn a member of the Privy Council in 1837. He was twice married—first, in 1830, to Lady Amelia Fitz-Clarence, youngest sister of the first Earl of Munster, who died in 1858; and secondly, in 1859, to Elizabeth Catherine, youngest daughter of the late General Joseph Gubbins, of Kilrush, county Limerick, and widow of the ninth Duke of St. Albans. By the first marriage the Viscount had issue the Hon. Lucius Cary, Master of Falkland, who died in 1871. Lord Falkland died at Montpellier, France, March 5, the viscounty devolving upon his brother, Admiral the Hon. Plantagenet Pierrepont Cary.

William Blanchard Jerrold.—March 10, at his residence in Victoria Street, aged 57, William Blanchard Jerrold. He was the eldest son of Douglas Jerrold, and inherited much of his father's literary power. He was born in London in 1826. He was educated at the Brompton Grammar School, and also in France, and having studied as an artist he published some illustrations to his father's articles in the *Illustrated Magazine*. When the *Daily News* was started in 1846 he was engaged as one of its staff, and wrote a series of articles on "The Literature of the Poor." He represented that paper also at the Paris Exhibitions in 1855 and 1867; and wrote a series of military studies of the French army, which was republished in 1869, under the title of "The French under Arms." Meanwhile he had succeeded his father as the editor of *Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper*. He wrote occasionally for many London newspapers, and was a very large and popular contributor to some of the magazines. Though journalism and periodical literature chiefly occupied his time, he was a most productive author. The farce "Cool as a Cucumber," in which Mr. Charles Mathews found one of his most popular characters, was written by Mr. Blanchard Jerrold in 1851. His intimate knowledge of Paris and of the French people was shown not only in the articles already mentioned, but in such works as "The Children of Lutetia," an account of the French poor and of the way in which they are looked after in Paris; and "At Home in Paris." He was the intimate friend of Gustave Doré, and wrote the letterpress which accompanied that great artist's illustrations of life in London. He had also very lately com-

pleted "The Life of Napoleon III." He was the biographer of George Cruikshank, as he had been of his father, Douglas Jerrold. His stories were also widely read, and he was the author of some gastronomical works and essays.

Charlotte Baroness de Rothschild was born in 1819, being the daughter of Baron Charles, of Frankfort, afterwards of Naples; and married, in 1836, Baron Lionel. They became the parents of Sir Nathaniel (who succeeded, by special limitation, to the baronetcy of his uncle, the late Sir Anthony); Mr. Alfred de Rothschild, a director of the Bank of England; Mr. Leopold de Rothschild, a D.L. of London, &c.; Leonora, who married Baron Alphonse de Rothschild, of Paris and Ferrières; and Evelina, who wedded in 1865 Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild, then of Vienna, and died in the following year, the Evelina Hospital in Southwark Bridge Road being founded by Baron Ferdinand in her memory. The late baroness had in no stinted measure the benevolent feelings which have distinguished her family. Before a visit to the dwellings of the poor became fashionable, her cab drove frequently to the most wretched districts of Spitalfields and Whitechapel. Every week, till failing health obliged her to give up both her duties and her pleasures, she visited the Jews' Free School, and spent hours in inspection and examination of children and teachers. She maintained at her own expense a kitchen for invalids at Sandys Row, Bishopsgate, where rations were given to the sick poor on the production of a medical certificate. She founded in 1859 the Home for Aged Incurables in Bedford Square, Commercial Road; gave clothing to the poorer girls of the Jews' Free School; and was in effect head of a large charitable organisation, in the administration of which she had many almoners. Her charitable avocations did not prevent her from cultivating the graces as well as undergoing the toils of life. Till shortly before the death of her husband (in 1879) she exercised a courtly hospitality at 148 Piccadilly, the spacious mansion between the two parks, in which her husband's collections of works of art were deposited. Here Count Persigny and Mr. Disraeli spoke polished addresses on the marriages of her daughters. The records of the movements of crowned personages on their visits to London usually included a visit to her house. She was fond of promoting

the training and subsequently the *début* of young musicians, and had launched more than one of those who afterwards achieved a considerable measure of success. Having received her early training at her father's Neapolitan villa, she spoke Italian, as well as French and German, perfectly; and she has left not only translations, but also original works in her "Addresses to Young Children," "Prayers and Meditations," and, in "From January to December," a charming collection of sketches. The last years of the Baroness were passed in seclusion and retirement at her house at Gunnersbury Park, where she died March 13, aged 64.

Lord Mostyn.—The Right Hon. Edward Mostyn Lloyd-Mostyn, second Lord Mostyn, of Mostyn, Flintshire, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom, was the elder and only surviving son of Edward Price, first lord, by marriage with Elizabeth, third daughter of the late Sir Roger Mostyn, and was born at Mostyn Hall on January 13, 1795. He was educated at Westminster School, and was one of the few surviving Liberals of the old school, who sat in the unreformed House of Commons. He was first returned to St. Stephen's as member for Flintshire in 1831, and sat till 1837, when he was defeated by Sir Stephen Glynne. At the General Election in 1841, Mr. Lloyd-Mostyn was again returned for the county, but was unseated on petition. He then sat for Lichfield from January 1846 till August 1847, when he was once more elected for Flintshire, and sat till his accession to the peerage on the death of his father in April 1854. He assumed the name of his maternal uncle, Sir Thomas Mostyn, on inheriting his estates in 1381. He was Lord Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of the county of Merioneth, and held the colonelcy of the Merionethshire Militia from 1847 to 1852, in which year he was appointed a deputy-lieutenant of the county of Flint. He was nominated "Vice-Admiral" of the coast of North Wales and Carmarthenshire, in 1854. Lord Mostyn married, in 1827, Lady Harriet Margaret Scott, eldest daughter of the second Earl of Clonmel, by whom he left surviving issue three sons and four daughters. He died March 17 at his ancestral seat, Mostyn Hall, Flintshire, his grandson, Llewellyn Lloyd-Mostyn, who was born in 1856, succeeding to the title.

François Mignet, an eminent French historian, was born in 1796 at Aix en

Provence, and, being sent to the *lycée* of that town, showed such precocity of talent that the public schools inspectors removed him as an exhibitor to the college of Avignon. Returning to Aix to study law, he formed his friendship with Thiers, and the two comrades were called to the Bar together in 1818. Three years later, Mignet won, conjointly with M. Arthur Beugnot, a prize offered by the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres for an essay on "The State of France under the Reign of Louis IX." After this success, Mignet went to settle in Paris, whither Thiers soon followed him, and both at once found employment as journalists—Thiers on the *Constitutionnel* and Mignet on the *Courier Français*.

His connection with the *Courier Français* brought him into connection with Talleyrand, and his conversation with that statesman concerning the events of the Revolution induced Mignet to prepare a history of that period, which appeared in 1824. No full history of the Revolution had been published up to that time; there had only been volumes of reminiscences, relating chiefly to the misdeeds of the Terrorists, and the few apologists of the Revolution who had put their recollections in print had not been possessed of talent enough to save their books from odium. Mignet's history, which has been translated into a dozen languages, and which is now a standard work all the world over, was accepted from the first as offering the best possible exposition of the causes which led to the Revolution and made it what it was. "From the day when it came out," said Guizot, "the Bourbons had to reckon with two Oppositions—that of the rising generation of Liberals, and that of the dead whom Mignet brought to life again, whose motives he vindicated, and whose vilified characters he cleansed."

For some years after the Revolution of 1830 Mignet published nothing. He was preparing a "History of the Reformation," which has not appeared to this day. This book was intended to be the *magnum opus* of the author's life, and the vast scale on which it was conceived would have engrossed all his energies for twenty years if he had completed it as designed. But in 1823, on the death of Ferdinand VII., Mignet was asked to go on a private diplomatic mission to Spain, his business being to inform Queen Christina's Government that France would support it against Don Carlos on certain conditions, one of which was made public a dozen years

later when the famous Spanish marriages took place. Mignet's own reward for conducting this delicate little affair to the satisfaction of both Governments was to have all the State archives of Madrid thrown open to his exploration, and this enabled him to write his "Negotiations relative to the Spanish Succession," the first part of which appeared in 1835, and the last in 1842.

In 1845 he published his "History of Antonio Perez." The "History of Mary Stuart" appeared in 1851, and many doubtful points in the Scottish Queen's life were cleared up by the information which Mignet had discovered in State documents. In 1854 appeared Mignet's "History of the Emperor Charles V.'s abdication, his sojourn and death at the monastery of Saint Yuste." This was founded on important papers obtained from the archives of Simancas, and it dispelled most of the legend which had been invented as to the great emperor's last years.

A period of twenty-one years now elapsed during which Mignet returned to his "History of the Reformation," and it was not till 1875 that he published the last great work which was to appear in his lifetime—the "Rivalry of Francis I. and Charles V." From that date till the close of his life he was understood to be labouring, whenever his health permitted, at his favourite book, which at his death remained still in manuscript.

Mignet succeeded Charles Comte as member of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences in 1832, and in 1836 he was nominated to the French Academy. He died at Paris, March 24.

H.R.H. The Duke of Albany.—Leopold George Duncan Albert, Duke of Albany, Earl of Clarence, and Baron Arklow, was born at Buckingham Palace on April 7, 1853. He was the Queen's eighth child, and was named after Her Majesty's uncle, Leopold I., the late King of the Belgians. His christening took place at Buckingham Palace on June 28, 1853, and his sponsors were the late King of Hanover, the Princess of Prussia, the Princess Mary of Cambridge, and the Prince of Hohenlohe Langenburg.

The Prince suffered from delicate health from his infancy. Through the very fact that he was an invalid, and lay for so many long hours on sofas, he grew curious about his letters at an earlier age than any of his brothers or sisters, and he could read when he was little more than five.

He was not yet nine years old when he lost his father. A sorrowful little figure, in Highland dress, he appeared at the funeral in St. George's Chapel, holding his eldest brother's hand, and his boyish grief was touching to see. After this he and his younger sister, the Princess Beatrice, became the Queen's most constant companions. When he was confined to his room he liked to hear music and poetry, to have dogs and birds round him, and to watch games in which he could not join. When he was able to move about, his gaiety was often exuberant, and found vent in schoolboy pranks. As he grew older he displayed an earnest devotion to study; and though through Her Majesty's seclusion her young children saw much less society than their elders, Her Majesty received more private friends than before, and Prince Leopold's homely education was consequently assisted by frequent and familiar intercourse with men of note. Professor Tyndall, among others, has given his testimony to the signs of promise he discerned in the Prince when the latter was a boy. Dean Stanley was also one of his earliest mentors; and it is said that at one time Prince Leopold's mind took such a deep religious impress from the Dean's conversations that he talked of becoming himself a clergyman. There is nothing improbable in this, but even if the story be not true, it is undeniable that the Prince was always of a reverent disposition in regard to sacred things, and loved to talk about them. Church music, too, was delightful to him, and some of the happiest hours of his boyhood were spent in learning to play on the harmonium and to sing favourite hymns. In after years Dean Stanley dedicated to him a beautiful poem, "The Untravelled Traveller." The purport of it was that the Prince had in his illnesses journeyed many times near to the bourne whence "no traveller returns," but had always returned in safety; and the poem was, further, written as a consolation to one who had pined so much for travel, but had been repeatedly disappointed by ill-health of projected journeys. The time came when his health improved a little, and in 1872 he was sent to Oxford. He matriculated at Christ Church, but lived with his private tutor at Wykeham House, on the confines of the town. Lectures, walks, occasional attendance at the debates of the Union, filled up Prince Leopold's time at the University. He could not hunt or take part in other rough

sports, and it was supposed that he would eventually try for honours. There were reasons which militated against this course, and chiefly this one, that the excitement of hard reading might have proved injurious. The question of health had to be considered in all that the Prince did, and when he left Oxford his doctors had to give their fiat against his applying himself to any regular occupation that might overtax his energies. He was sworn a member of the Privy Council in 1874; but he was not given a commission in the army, and he was not created a peer. It was not until 1881 that the Dukedom of Albany was revived in his favour, and not until his marriage did he get the right to wear military uniform. As to the House of Lords, it was known that he took a keen interest in politics, and it was apprehended that he might throw himself with too much ardour into the debates of Parliament. Perhaps, also, it was feared that his speeches might astonish the world by their independence, and bring him too much before the public in the character of Royal "freelance," which he certainly never wished to assume.

While at Oxford he was initiated into the mysteries of Freemasonry, and he ever afterwards continued to take a lively interest in everything pertaining to the craft. When admitted to the House of Lords, his entrance was not followed by any of those oratorical displays which some persons had anticipated, but whenever he delivered a public address his utterances attracted universal attention on account of the marked ability and thoughtfulness they displayed. That which he delivered at Manchester when developing the scheme for the Royal College of Music was a notable performance. It abounded in knowledge as to the history of music in this country; and threw out very practical suggestions about the means for promoting musical studies. Within less than a year after his elevation, the Duke was betrothed to the Princess Hélène, daughter of the Duke of Waldeck and Pyrmont, and Parliament was asked to vote the usual grants for His Royal Highness's establishment. An allowance of 15,000*l.* a year had been voted to him when he attained his majority, and 10,000*l.* more was now proposed. The cares of married life fell upon the young wife very soon after her wedding, for she had to nurse her husband through a new attack of his old illness. He recovered, however, so completely that his medical attendants

began to hope that his constitution was gaining strength; but their anticipations were not realised, for while on a visit to Cannes, on March 27, the Duke, while mounting the stairs rather rapidly, at the *Cercle Nautique*, slipped, fell, and hurt his right knee—the same from injuries to which he had previously suffered, and though at first it seemed as though he had sustained no injury, he died early in the morning of the following day, March 28, from an effusion of blood on the brain inducing an epileptic convulsion, an event which awakened the most profound regret throughout the whole nation.

Earl of Seafield.—The Right Hon. Ian Charles Ogilvie-Grant, eighth Earl of Seafield, was the only son of John Charles, seventh earl, K.T., by his marriage with the Hon. Caroline Stuart, youngest daughter of Robert Walter, eleventh Lord Blantyre, and was born on October 7, 1861. He was educated at Eton, and in 1871 he entered the Army as a cornet in the 1st Life Guards, from which he retired as a lieutenant in 1877. He succeeded his father as eighth earl in 1881, and he was a deputy-lieutenant for the counties of Banff and Inverness. His full titles, as given in Lodge's Peerage, are "Earl of Seafield; Viscount Reidhaven and Seafield, and Lord Ogilvy of Deskford and Cullen, Banffshire, in the Peerage of Scotland; Baron Strathspey, of Strathspey, in the counties of Inverness and Moray, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom, and a baronet of England and of Nova Scotia." The barony of the United Kingdom was conferred in 1858 on his lordship's father, who had been for some time a representative peer for Scotland. He died March 31 at Claridge's Hotel.

Nicholas Trübner, founder and chief of the well-known publishing house of Trübner & Co., was born at Heidelberg in 1817, and had distinguished himself by his cleverness at the Gymnasium of his native town before he was apprenticed to Mohr, the Heidelberg publisher, who introduced him to the calling of his own selection. From Mohr's house he went, on the expiration of his apprenticeship, to Vandenhoek and Ruprecht, of Göttingen. Two years later he was with Hoffman and Campe, of Hamburg, whom he left for similar employment, under circumstances more conducive to his knowledge of publishing and literature, in the establishment of Wilmann, of Frankfurt. Here he attracted the attention of Mr. William Longman, and

in 1843 he was offered a place in the great house in Paternoster Row—an offer that was seized by the young man, who had for years been looking to London as the capital where he was most likely to become a great publisher. Nine years later he had acquired the comprehensive acquaintance with the literary commerce of Germany and England that gave him the self-confidence needful for his next and most hazardous step. Parting company with the Longmans, he started, greatly assisted by Mr. Nutt, on his own account in Paternoster Row, whence he moved, some ten years since, to the well-known quarters of Trübner and Co. in Ludgate Hill.

He took an intense interest in his business, and avowed the object of his ambition was to become one of the first publishers in London, a wish which was speedily realised. For a while he was a publisher of belles-lettres, producing some of Charles Reade's best and most popular novels; and to the last he indulged in publishing the works and cultivating the society of some of the choicest American humorists. But the direction of his intellect was for philology, history, religious philosophy, and Oriental literature; and his place amongst publishers was made by the discretion and enterprise he displayed in producing books having reference to these subjects. That the position was no higher than his merits will be admitted by every one familiar with his *Oriental Record*. In truth, his place in "the trade" and the value of his services to literature were never fully recognised in London or in England. It was otherwise in America, with whose leading publishers he maintained close correspondence, in the several colonies that looked to him as their literary agent, and especially in British India, for whose benefit he produced the most important of his educational works. How widely his commercial success differed from that of ordinary London booksellers is indicated by the number of the foreign decorations conferred, in recognition of his literary services, on the Ludgate Hill publisher, who wore the Crown Order of Prussia (third and fourth class), the Order of the Ernestine Branch of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, together with the Orders of Franz Joseph of Austria, St. Olaf of Sweden, the Lion of Zähringen, and the White Elephant. Mr. Trübner was also remarkable amongst publishers for the number of his literary friendships. Douglas Jerrold, Octave Delepiere (whose only child he married), Robert Bell, G. H.

Lewes, W. R. Greg, J. Doran, Hepworth Dixon, and Professor Palmer are only a few of the departed authors with

whom he was closely associated. He died at Maida Vale March 31.

During the month also the following deaths took place:—On March 8, at Brighton, aged 80, **Admiral Sir Sidney Colpoys Dacres, G.C.B.**, Governor of Greenwich Hospital, the son of Vice-Admiral Sir Richard Dacres, G.C.H. He served with distinction in Greece, Spain, and the Crimea, held commands on the principal stations, and was some time a Lord of the Admiralty. On March 13, at Margate, **Richard Henry Horne**, an author, poet, and journalist, who was born January 1, 1803. In early life he entered the Mexican Naval Service, but after a most adventurous career returned to England and began the life of a man of letters. He was a voluminous writer, his first production appearing in 1828, and his latest in 1883. One of the best known of his works was "Orion: an Epic Poem," in three books, which he published in 1843, at the price of one farthing. In 1852 he went to the Australian gold-fields, and obtained important Government employment in connection with them, but returned to England in 1869, and resumed his literary activity. In 1874 he was awarded a Civil List pension of 50*l.* a year, which was afterwards increased to 100*l.* On March 13, at the battle of Tamasi, **Major Walker Aitken**, 1st Battalion Black Watch. He served in India, in Ashantee, and in the two Egyptian campaigns. On March 14, at Biella, Piedmont, aged 57, **Quintino Sella**, one of Italy's most distinguished statesmen. He entered the Italian Parliament in 1860, and was soon given office in various Cabinets. He laboured indefatigably for the improvement of the financial condition of Italy. On March 17, at East Wittering Rectory, Chichester, aged 79, **Rev. John Pain Sargent, M.A., F.R.A.S.**, the author of several works upon the Hebrew language, and of a number of valuable astronomical and scientific papers. On March 18, **Sir Arthur Douglas Bateman Scott, F.L.S., F.R.G.S.**, of Great Barr Hall, Staffordshire, and of Hartington, Derbyshire, aged 23, the only surviving son of the late Sir Francis Edward Scott, of Great Barr. He succeeded his brother as fifth baronet in 1871. The late Sir Francis inherited the baronetcy of his maternal grandfather, Sir Hugh Bateman of Hartington, as well as that of Scott of Great Barr. On March 19, aged 82, **Elias Lönnrot**. A Finn by birth, he began in 1828 to collect Finnish proverbs, rhymes, and folks-tales, travelling for the purpose into the most remote districts. He published the "Kalevala," a great epic poem which he pieced together from the oral recitation of the natives, and numerous other works dealing with Finnish language and literature. On March 23, at New York, aged 68, **Madame Anna Bishop**, an English singer of world-wide celebrity. The daughter of Mr. Riviere, an artist, she married Sir Henry Bishop, the composer, and subsequently Mr. Schutz of New York. On March 21, at Cleveland Gardens, aged 51, **Henry Richmond Droop**, a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, where he was mathematical lecturer; he was called to the Bar, but he was chiefly known for his studies in the antiquities of ecclesiastical post-Reformation law, and in the theory of proportional representation.

APRIL.

Jean Baptiste Dumas, an illustrious French chemist and scientist, was born at Alais, in the Department of Gard, July 14, 1800, of an ancient family, a Protestant branch of which emigrated at the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Young Dumas received a good classical education in his native town. He was intended for a naval career, but the events of 1814–15 compelled his parents to choose another profession for him, and the future chemist was apprenticed to an apothecary in Alais. In 1816 he went to Geneva to pursue his pharmaceutical studies, and had the advantage of attending the lectures of such eminent scientists as De Candolle, Pictet,

and Gaspard De La Rive; he had also the run of a large laboratory belonging to the pharmacy of De Royer. Here a group of fellow-students gathered around him, and, supplying the deficiencies of the laboratory as best he could, M. Dumas began his career as a professor in a small way.

M. Dumas's name, however, is first met with in scientific literature in connection with certain researches on iodine, undertaken at the request of a Genevan physician who was seeking for a specific against goitre. The discovery created a great sensation at the time. Another Genevan physician, Dr. J. L. Prévost, got M. Dumas to join him in

certain researches, the purpose of which was to place physiology on a new and more scientific basis. Discoveries were made as to the constitution of the blood by the two *sarants*, and these have ever since formed the starting-point in similar researches. The physiologist and the chemist carried their investigations into other regions of their joint subject, with results of the greatest importance not only to a scientific knowledge of the animal body, but also to medical practice. Still M. Dumas did not neglect his own special researches, and achieved so great a reputation in Geneva that he might have settled there comfortably for life, but a visit from Humboldt induced him to remove to Paris in 1821, and two years later he became Assistant Professor of Chemistry at the École Polytechnique. In 1828 he published the first volume of his "*Traité de Chimie appliquée aux Arts*," and in 1831, at the early age of 32, he was elected a member of the Academy of Sciences. In 1826 M. Dumas published a paper which has long been a classic on chemistry, "*On Some Points in the Atomic Theory*," giving the first steps in an investigation which goes to the very foundation of all science. His researches in this line continued through life, and while some eminent chemists do not accept his conclusions, all admit that they are the work of a master mind. Equally epoch-making researches on the ethers, on carbon, on oxygen, and other staple chemical problems brought M. Dumas into the very front rank of his science. Indeed, some of the problems which he touched and some of the questions he ventured to ask led him into regions of burning interest, and help us somewhat to get a little nearer to a conception of the constitution of matter. On his promotion to the chemical professorship in the École de Médecine, M. Dumas tackled the problem of the connection between animal and vegetable life, and his researches on alcoholic fermentation, published in 1872, would in themselves have made the reputation, if not the fortune, of any investigator. We have already referred to his "*Traité de Chimie*;" this was followed, ten years later, by his celebrated "*Leçons sur la Philosophie Chimique*," in which he traces the development of chemical doctrines from the remotest antiquity down to his own time. But to catalogue his various works and papers would be an almost endless task.

He entered political life at the time of the Revolution of 1848, and in Octo-

ber 1849 Louis Napoleon appointed him Minister of Commerce, and he held this portfolio till January 1851, doing an immense amount of good in these fifteen months. He instituted the *Crédit Foncier*, which flourishes in great prosperity to this day; he also founded the "*Caisse de Retraite pour la Vieillesse*," and several other agricultural charities which were less successful. Soon after the restoration of the Empire he was created a senator, receiving in this capacity 1,200*l.* a year; and in 1855 he was appointed President of the Municipal Council of the Seine. His friends were rather hurt to see him accept this office. The municipal franchises of Paris had been suppressed, and it was thought that a man who still called himself a Liberal ought not to have consented to preside over a State-appointed Board which spent the money of the ratepayers without the sanction of the latter. Nevertheless the assistance which M. Dumas gave to Baron Haussmann during the re-edification of Paris was of the most beneficial kind. The Baron traced new streets, but M. Dumas showed how the houses in them were to be made healthy; and the Parisians owe him much for the vigour with which he insisted that the mighty works of drainage commenced by the engineer Bellegrand should be carried on to rapid completion, instead of being retarded for the sake of more showy operations.

After the downfall of the Empire, M. Dumas withdrew from public life, but was as busy as ever in the service of science. Until within the last year of his life he spoke pretty often at the sittings of the Academy of Sciences, of which he was long Permanent Secretary, and at those of the French Academy, to which he was elected in 1875 as successor to M. Guizot. M. Dumas also did some very useful work recently by denouncing the adulteration of wines; and it was largely owing to his efforts that the Municipal Council established in 1881 their public analytical laboratory, where anybody may now take wines for examination on payment of a small fee. No scientific commission of importance was complete without him, and one of the last reports he read to the Academy of Sciences was on the work of the International Commission of Weights and Measures, only a few months before his death. He died at Cannes, April 11, in his 84th year.

Charles Reade, an eminent English

novelist, dramatist, and social reformer, was born in 1814, and after education at a private school went to Oxford as a demy of Magdalen, where he took his degree in 1836, and afterwards became a Fellow of his College. In 1843 he was called to the Bar at Lincoln's Inn, and commenced also writing for the press, but it was not till 1853 that he appeared before the public as a novelist by the publication of his "Peg Woffington." The following year there appeared "Christie Johnstone," but it was the publication of the famous story entitled "It is Never Too Late to Mend," in 1857, that made his fame as a writer. This work was very useful in its exposure of the horrors of the then-prevailing prison system, and the scenes and adventures in the Australian gold diggings still remain one of the best pictures yet written of the stirring life of the period depicted. Three novels of no great merit—"Jack of all Trades," "Love me Little, Love me Long," and "White Lies"—followed "It is Never Too Late to Mend," and then in 1861 appeared "The Cloister and the Hearth," which must be rated as the author's best work. It is too long, and the interest flags often through a want of continuity in the incidents; but every chapter offers a vivid little picture of the social life of the middle ages, and bears evidence of genuine historical research. The wanderings of young Gerard, the Dutch painter, with his friend Denis, the halberdier, may, indeed, be read for instruction as well as amusement. The Rome of the "age of faith" was never better portrayed than it is in this book, and among the author's little character sketches of Churchmen, what reader will ever forget the scholarly, mythology-worshipping, art-loving monk Jerome? "Hard Cash," which was first published as a serial in *All the Year Round*, appeared two years after "The Cloister and the Hearth," and was meant to show up both the imperfections of the lunacy laws and the evils of private asylums. "Griffith Gaunt" followed "Hard Cash;" then came "Foul Play," a most captivating novel of adventures caused by the wreck of a scuttled ship. This work was written conjointly with Mr. Dion Boucicault; and after it, in 1870, the *Cornhill Magazine* published "Put Yourself in his Place." The country was in that year much excited about the recent revelations as to trades-union outrages at Sheffield which had been elicited by a Royal Commission. In this novel are to be

found all the qualities which distinguished Mr. Reade's best work—rapidity of narrative, strong pointed English, quaint dialogue, abundance of incident, and a perfect insight into dramatic situations. The description of the Sheffield floods is a really grand piece of writing, unsurpassed by any other performance of the same order in English fiction. But it was the last very good thing that Mr. Reade ever wrote, and his subsequent works hardly sustained the reputation he had gained by his earlier labours. As a dramatist also Mr. Reade attained considerable success. In 1852 he wrote, in conjunction with Tom Taylor, a comedy entitled "Masks and Faces," which has become a stock piece; and "The First Printer," produced in 1856, "Dora," in 1867, "The Wandering Heir," "Kate Peyton's Lovers," and his version of the French "L'Assommoir," all display ability of an exceptional order. A kind-hearted man, amiable and lovable in private life, his hasty disposition and fiery zeal for the reform of social abuses led him into many controversies, and his house at Knightsbridge became something like the Cave of Adullam when it was the refuge of David. To him came the escaped or discharged lunatic who thought his doctors mad, the trade-unionist who had been picketed, the inventor who could not get a hearing in Pall Mall, the seaman with his tale of rascally shipowners and over-insured ships, and even the ticket-of-leave man who had been dissatisfied with the arrangements at Dartmoor. To the lamentations of these and other such victims Mr. Reade inclined with open ears and heart; but in his serious longing to bring their wrongs before the world, he often gave them an amount of his time which would have been better spent for the sake of his *protégés*, as well as his own, in the more careful preparation of his literary works. The latter years of his life were clouded by ill-health, and after a prolonged illness he died at his residence at Shepherd's Bush, April 11.

Bishop of Ripon.—The Right Rev. Robert Bickersteth, D.D., Bishop of Ripon, was the fourth son of the Rev. John Bickersteth, rector of Sapcote, Leicestershire, and was the younger brother of Dr. Edward Bickersteth, Dean of Lichfield. Originally he was trained for the medical profession, and was a student of St. Thomas's Hospital; but feeling a vocation for the ministry, in which so many of his name had been

eminent, he entered Queen's College, Cambridge, with the intention of reading for Holy Orders. Under the circumstances he could hardly be expected to distinguish himself in the Tripos; and accordingly in the degree list for 1841 we find his name no higher than the Junior Optimes, or third class. He was at once ordained, and became curate to his father; and in 1845, after holding curacies at Reading and Clapham, he was appointed to the incumbency of St. John's, Clapham. After six years in this post, he accepted the important and arduous rectory of St. Giles-in-the-Fields. In 1846 he married a daughter of Mr. Joseph Garde, of Cork. Already at Clapham he had made a reputation in Evangelical circles as an excellent preacher; and this reputation was increased by his sermons at St. Giles's. In 1854 he was appointed Canon of Salisbury, and towards the end of 1856, when he was but just forty years of age, he was made Bishop of Ripon, on the translation of Dr. Longley to the see of Durham. Consecrated on the 18th of the following January, Dr. Bickersteth was thus at the time of his death, though by no means the oldest in years, the senior bishop on the bench. Dr. Bickersteth was a pronounced and consistent Evangelical, in the technical acceptance of that term. He was one of a group of clergy, all belonging to the same party in the Church, and all, it must be owned, more eminent for their advocacy of the doctrines of that party than for either scholarship or administrative power, whom Lord Palmerston chose almost simultaneously to preside over several sees. It was commonly supposed at the time that the influence of his noble relative Lord Shaftesbury had counted for something in directing the choice of the Prime Minister; and Dr. Montagu Villiers, of Carlisle; Dr. Charles Baring, of Gloucester and Bristol; and Dr. Bickersteth, of Ripon, were indifferently spoken of as "Lord Shaftesbury's" or "Lord Palmerston's bishops." Dr. Bickersteth long survived the other two, as he survived the majority of those clergy who held the precise doctrines which he professed. His latter years were not free from the attacks which must be expected by every man who continues to hold a leading position when the ideas which he represents have ceased to be dominant. During the closing period of his life he was prevented by the state of his health from taking a very active part in public affairs, to play an im-

portant part in such organisations as the Church Missionary Society and the Church Pastoral Aid Society, and all the kindred institutions with which the name of Bickersteth has a historical and hereditary connection. By all these societies, as by the clergy of his diocese and the Evangelical section of the Church of England, his loss was sincerely regretted. He died at his palace, April 15, in his 68th year, having been born at Acton, in Suffolk, August 24, 1816.

Duke of Buccleuch.—Walter Francis Montagu-Douglas-Scott, fifth Duke of Buccleuch and seventh Duke of Queensberry, whose death took place on April 16, was born on November 25, 1806. He was the second son of his father, who was then, and until six years later, Earl of Dalkeith. His elder brother, George Henry, Lord Scott, was then the next heir to the dukedom; but on his death, in 1808, the Hon. Walter Francis Montagu became Lord Scott, and so continued to be styled till his father succeeded to the dukedom in 1812, when Lord Scott became Earl of Dalkeith. His father died in 1819, and then he became Duke of Buccleuch at the age of thirteen. His education was carefully attended to by his uncle and guardian, Lord Montagu, while Sir Walter Scott, who had been a warm friend of his father, and entertained a strong feudal regard for the head of his clan, gave much good advice as to the direction which the boy's studies should take. He was sent first to Eton, and then to St. John's College, Cambridge, where he graduated M.A. in 1827. Even before that, however, he may be said to have entered public life, for on the occasion of the visit of King George IV. to Scotland, in 1822, the Duke, then a boy of sixteen, was his host, and entertained His Majesty in princely style at Dalkeith Palace for fourteen days. It was not, therefore, as a stranger that he appeared before the King four years later, when he was presented to His Majesty and was sworn in as Lord-Lieutenant of the county of Midlothian. He held that dignity till the end of his life, and with it the Lord-Lieutenancy of Roxburghshire, conferred on him in 1841.

In August 1829 he was married to the Lady Charlotte Anne Thynne, daughter of Thomas, second Marquess of Bath; and in 1831 there was born to them their eldest son, William Henry Walter, long known as Earl of Dalkeith, and who succeeded him as the sixth Duke of Buccleuch. From the time he

came of age the Duke ever earnestly devoted himself to the management and improvement of his enormous territorial possessions, and applied himself steadily and determinedly to the subject of agriculture. He was elected president of the Highland Agricultural Society, in 1831, and filled the same office a second time in 1866. He also endeavoured to maintain the reputation of his house for encouraging literature and the arts, and in recognition of his efforts in these directions the University of Oxford, in 1834, conferred on him the degree of D.C.L. About that time he was meditating one of the greatest undertakings ever entered on by a private individual in Scotland—the building of Granton Pier and Breakwater. There being a great lack of good harbours on the east coast, it was suggested that Granton, on the Forth, three miles from Edinburgh, and on the Duke's property, was admirably adapted to be the site of such a work, and that the place might by-and-by grow to be an important seaport. The suggestion was warmly taken up by the Duke, who obtained a favourable report on the scheme from Messrs. Stevenson & Sons, engineers, and at once resolved to begin the undertaking. The pier, which is 1,700 feet long by 180 feet broad, was begun in 1835, and was partially opened for use on the day of the Queen's Coronation, in 1838, though not finished till six years later. The cost of the work, which was entirely borne by the Duke of Buccleuch, amounted to no less than half a million sterling. The scheme included a breakwater of solid masonry, forming a harbour on both sides of the pier, and enclosing an area of 130 acres. This enterprise, which showed remarkable public spirit, has been of great benefit to the trade of Scotland. In politics, the Duke from the first attached himself to the Conservative party, and in 1842, on the resignation of the Duke of Buckingham, Sir Robert Peel offered him the post of Lord Privy Seal. The Duke accepted the post, and retained it, with a seat in the Cabinet, till January 1846, when he was transferred to the office of President of the Council, which he held till the Ministry retired. His Grace was thus a member of the Cabinet that proposed and carried the repeal of the Corn Laws. Since 1846 the Duke held no political office; but he continued to be a staunch adherent and a trusted counsellor of the Conservative leaders. He naturally took the greatest interest in measures affecting

Scotland, and his will determined the fate of not a few of them.

In 1859 the Duke was put forward by the Conservatives as a candidate for the office of Chancellor of the University of Edinburgh, but he was defeated by Lord Brougham. He remained, however, a staunch friend of the University, which acknowledged his services to it and to Scotland by conferring on him the degree of LL.D. in 1874, and in the same year he received the same honour from his own University, Cambridge.

In 1867 he was elected President of the British Association during its Dundee meeting. In 1862 he was made President of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland; and in 1878 he was elected Chancellor of the University of Glasgow. In addition to the offices and honours already mentioned, his Grace was High Steward of Westminster, and a Governor of the Charter House. He was a member of the Board of Trustees for Manufactures, Vice-President of the Royal Institution for the Encouragement of the Fine Arts in Scotland, and President of the Architectural Society of Scotland; President of the Scottish Musical Society, President of the Royal Caledonian Horticultural Society, Governor of the Royal Bank of Scotland, member of Council of the Highland and Agricultural Society, patron of the Lothians Racing Club, patron of the Edinburgh Dumfriesshire Society, and director or president of a great many other associations, to all of which he was a generous friend.

Sir Michael Costa.—Sir Michael Costa, whose death took place at his residence, West Brighton, April 29th, was born at Naples, on February 4th, 1810, and was educated at the Royal Academy of Music of that city, his talent, shown at an early age, having gained him a King's Scholarship. At the age of 15 he composed a cantata called "L'Immagine," followed in rapid succession by two operas performed at the theatre of the Academy. A mass, an oratorio ("La Passione"), and other sacred works belong to the same period. In 1828 his first appearance before the general public took place by means of the opera "Il Carcere d'Idalgonda," written for and performed at the Teatro Nuovo; and this was followed the year after by a more important work, "Malvina," produced at the San Carlo, Naples, one of the leading theatres of Italy. His first journey to and permanent settlement in this country took place undersomewhat peculiar circumstances.

The Committee of the Birmingham Festival had commissioned Zingarelli to write and conduct a "Cantata Sacra," and the famous composer being himself unable to come to England, entrusted Costa, one of his favourite pupils, with the production of the work. Costa accordingly arrived at Birmingham, but his offer to conduct the cantata was refused by the committee, who not unnaturally were unwilling to give so responsible a part to a youth of 19. They offered him, however, an engagement as a singer, and this Costa was obliged to accept, in order to cover his travelling expenses, although neither his voice nor his experience qualified him for such a task. It was, therefore, as a *tenorino*, and not as a conductor, that Costa first appeared on an English concert platform, in a duet (with Miss Fanny Ayton) from Rossini's "Donna del Lago." The result was such as might have been expected, and Costa's career as a singer ended where it had begun. In other respects, however, his visit to Birmingham was not to be without important results, for the talent of the young Italian attracted general attention in musical circles, and in 1832 he was made chief conductor at the King's Theatre. During his long connection with this theatre he brought the orchestral playing to a degree of perfection previously unknown in English opera-houses. That connection came to a close in 1846, owing to a disagreement with Lumley, the then manager, and Costa joined the rival enterprise of Covent Garden, where he continued for several years. Ultimately, however (in 1871), he returned to Her Majesty's, and conducted the performances there till a few seasons back, when he finally severed his connection with the stage. As an operatic conductor Costa was distinguished by a zeal and energy which, combined with sound musical knowledge, secured his perfect authority both in the orchestra and on the stage. To that authority everyone had to bow in passive obedience, and even the most wilful *prima donna* would have hesitated before infringing the laws of rhythm by an uncalled-for *ritardando*. Costa's activity as an orchestral and choral leader was not, however, confined to the opera. In 1846 he undertook the conductorship of the Philharmonic Concerts, which he held till 1854. The numerous works which were brought out and performed under his leadership it would be impossible to specify. It may, however, be said that the English worship of Handel, although

by no means originated, was at least fostered by the repeated performances of his works at Exeter Hall. For several of Handel's oratorios Costa wrote additional accompaniments, which, although they have not met with the approval of musical purists, were at least found useful for their immediate purpose. Costa's own oratorios, "Eli" and "Naaman," were also among the stock pieces of the Sacred Harmonic repertoire. As musical director of these concerts, Costa had to conduct the grand Handel Festivals, started in 1857 at the Crystal Palace, and since 1859 triennially repeated. It was at these enormous gatherings that Costa's singular power of leading and inspiring large masses of executants was shown in its most brilliant light. Scarcely less important was his connection with the Birmingham Festivals, which he conducted ever since 1849. Here, on the scene of his early failure, his two oratorios already named were produced with great success. In 1869 he received the honour of knighthood. Many foreign sovereigns, including the Sultan, the King of Prussia, and the King of Italy, conferred decorations on him. In 1870 Costa went to Germany, where he conducted a performance of his "Eli" at Stuttgart. He also visited the Court of Berlin, and composed a *Preussien-Hymne*, dedicated to King William, who rewarded him by the Order already referred to. His own musical compositions comprise, besides minor pieces, such as the charming vocal quartet "Ecco quel fiero istante," several ballets, operas, and the two oratorios more than once referred to. The former belong to an early period, and include the ballet "Kenilworth" (1831), the opera "Malek Adhel," written for the Italian Opera in Paris (1837), and said to contain many pieces from the earlier work "Malvina," and "Don Carlos," generally considered his best dramatic work, and received with great approval in London (1844).

Michael Thomas Bass, at one time member for Derby, and head of the vast brewing establishment associated with his name, who died at his residence, Rangemoor, Burton-on-Trent, April 29, was born at the same place in 1799. Educated at the grammar school of his native town, Mr. Bass was afterwards trained to that business which enormously extended under his sagacity and enterprise, and which eventually made his name known throughout the civilised world. He

became member for Derby in 1847, and he continued to represent it uninterruptedly in Parliament for a period of upwards of 35 years, retiring from the representation in 1883. Mr. Bass was a staunch and consistent Liberal, and the occasions were rare indeed during his career when he found himself at variance with the leaders of his party. He was known for his assiduous attention to his Parliamentary duties; and he had that rare virtue of never rising in the House of Commons unless he had something to say. He was no orator, but his personal character had great weight, and there were few men on either side of the House who commanded in an equal degree the respect alike of political opponents and friends. There were some questions, especially those affecting the working classes, in which he took a keen interest.

Mr. Bass was almost as widely known for his beneficence as he was for his wealth and his business. Among other proofs of this, it may be men-

tioned that he built and endowed a new church at Burton, which is regarded as one of the finest of modern structures in the Midland counties. He also raised a smaller church near his residence, Rangemoor, a chapel of ease, and Sunday schools, together with an institute and reading-rooms for the use of the working classes of Burton, at a total cost of 80,000*l.* He further presented the town of Derby with a large recreation ground and public swimming baths at a cost of 12,000*l.*, as well as a free library upon which the sum of 25,000*l.* was expended. He was, moreover, equally liberal in the matter of his private charities. He was warmly interested in the cause of railway servants, and showed this interest in a variety of ways, one of them being in the founding of the Railway Servants' Orphanage at Derby.

Mr. Bass, who was a deputy-lieutenant for the counties of Derby and Stafford, married in 1835 the daughter of Major Samuel Arden, of Longcroft Hall, Staffordshire.

The following deaths also occurred during the month of April:—On April 1, in Brompton, **Miss Marie Litton** (Mrs. Wybrow Robertson). This clever actress came of a good Devonshire family, and made her first London appearance in 1868. She was at one time manager of the Court Theatre, and subsequently of the London Aquarium Theatre. On April 1, at Pallanza, aged 62, **General James Travers, C.B., V.C.**, son of the late Major-General Sir Robert Travers, C.B., K.C.M.G. He entered the Bengal army, and served in Afghanistan, in the Sutlej campaign, and in the Indian Mutiny. On April 5, at Lymington, Hants, aged 88, **General Pringle Taylor, K.H.** He was colonel of the 24th Regiment, served in India and Africa, and was some time commander of the forces, and Lieutenant Governor of Jamaica. On April 5, aged 65, **Henry Francis Cockayne Cust, of Cockayne, Hatley, Bedfordshire, and of Ellesmere House, Shropshire; M.P. for Grantham.** The son of the late Hon. and Rev. Henry Cockayne Cust, Canon of Windsor, he entered the army, and was aide-de-camp to four successive Viceroy of Ireland. Retiring from the army in 1854, he managed the extensive estates of his relatives, the late and present Earls Brownlow. On April 6, in Regent's Park, aged 85, **Peter Squire.** Chemist in Ordinary to the Queen, he was one of the founders of the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain, its examiner in botany, and three times elected its president. On April 6, at Lübeck, **Emanuel Geibel**, who was, perhaps, Germany's greatest lyric poet after Heine. On April 8, at Vienna, aged 73, **Herr Ignace Kuranda**, a distinguished Austrian Deputy of Jewish family. He founded the weekly political journal the *Grenzbote*, and also the *Ost-Deutsche Post*, which he directed till his death. On April 11, at Clapham Park, aged 48, **Henry J. Byron**, the popular dramatist. The son of the British Consul at Hayti, he was intended first for the navy, and afterwards for the medical profession, but, rejecting both, he became an eminently successful writer of burlesques and plays, and also an accomplished actor. He was of the same family as the poet. On April 11, in London, aged 61, **Rev John Henry Blunt**, the well-known author of the "History of the Reformation of the Church of England," and other theological and historical works. In 1873 he was nominated to the Crown living of Beverstone, Gloucestershire. On April 12, in Bruton Street, aged 78, **General Sir George Buller, G.C.B.**, Colonel Commandant of 1st Rifle Brigade. The son of the late General Frederick William Buller, of Telynt and Lanreath, Cornwall, served at the Cape of Good Hope in 1848, and was a brigadier-general of the Army of the East, in the Crimean war. Afterwards he commanded the troops in the Ionian Islands, and was some time in the command of the Southern Military District. On April 14, aged 70, **Adolphe de Leuven Comte Ribbing**, officer of the Legion of Honour, for some years lessee of the Opéra Comique, and a well-known

dramatic author, beginning that career in association with A. Dumas. He was the son of the Swedish Count Ribbing, who was banished with Count Horn in 1792. On April 16, in Wilton Street, aged 80, **General Sir George Henry Lockwood, K.C.B.**, Colonel of 3rd Hussars, who was the son of the late Mr. Thomas Lockwood, of Dan-y-Greig, Glamorganshire. He served throughout the campaign in Afghanistan in 1842, and he commanded a brigade at the battle of Goojerat, in the Punjab campaign of 1848-9. On April 17, at Upper Norwood, aged 78, **Mrs. Alfred Wigan**, the once well-known actress, and the widow of the actor Alfred Wigan. On April 20, aged 67, **Giovanni Battista Vara**. Born at Venice, he was the intimate friend of Daniel Manin, and his fellow-worker in initiating the Revolution of 1848. After having run the complete career of an Italian Liberal, he became, thirty years later, a Cabinet Minister of King Humbert's. On April 22, at Marseilles, aged 80, the **Dowager Countess Gilbert de Voisins**, who was formerly Marie Taglioni, the once famous opera-dancer. On April 26, **Viscount Torrington** (Sir George Byng, D.C.L.), Devon; Baron Byng, of Southill, Beds, and a baronet, who was born in 1812, and succeeded his father as seventh viscount in 1831. From 1847 to 1860 he was Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Ceylon. Three years after his return he was made a Lord-in-Waiting to the Prince Consort. He retained this post until 1859, when he became a Lord-in-Waiting to the Queen. He was J.P. and D.L. of Kent, and hon. colonel of the 3rd and 4th Battalion Queen's Own (Royal West Kent) Regiment. In 1833 he married Mary Anne, daughter of the late Sir John Dugdale Astley, and had issue one daughter, Frances Elizabeth, who died in 1853. On April 27, at Paris, **The Duchess of Wagram**, widow of Napoleon's aide-de-camp Berthier, who was the daughter of Count Clary, and the niece of Bernadotte, King of Sweden, and of Joseph Bonaparte. On April 28, at the Bridge of Allan, aged 65, **Dr. Kennedy**, of Dingwall, who was the recognised leader of the Free Church in the Highlands. On April 28, at Fulham, aged 93, **The Hon. William Henry Yelverton**, of Whitland Abbey, Carmarthenshire, son of second Viscount Avonmore, one time M.P. for Carmarthenshire. On April 30, at Keymer, Sussex, aged 62, **Sir Edward Clive Bayley, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.** The son of the late Mr. Edward Clive Bayley, of St. Petersburg, he passed through the several grades of the executive and judicial services of Bengal, and became Home Secretary to the Government of India, and an ordinary member of the Supreme Council. He was called to the Bar in England, and was for some years Vice-Chancellor of the University of Calcutta.

MAY.

Lord Raglan.—Richard Henry Fitzroy Somerset, second Lord Raglan, was the only surviving son of the first Lord Raglan, who died in command of our forces in the Crimea. His mother was Lady Emily Harriet, second daughter of William, third Earl of Mornington, and niece of the great Duke of Wellington, and he was born at Paris in 1817. He was for several years employed in the Civil Service in Ceylon, and from 1849 down to 1855 was private secretary to the late King of Hanover. He was a magistrate and deputy lieutenant for Monmouthshire, and formerly captain in the Gloucestershire Yeomanry Hussars. He was also a Lord-in-Waiting on Her Majesty in 1858-59 and again in 1866-69. He succeeded to his father's title in 1855. Lord Raglan was twice married—firstly, to Lady Georgiana Lygon, daughter of Henry, fourth Earl Beauchamp; and secondly, to Miss Mary Blanche Farquhar, daughter of Sir Walter Rockliffe Farquhar. He

died at the residence of his two sisters, 8 Chesterfield Street, London, May 3.

Sir Bartle Frere.—The Right Hon. Sir Henry Edward Bartle Frere, Bart., G.C.B., G.C.S.I., fifth son of Mr. Edward Frere, was born in a country district in Wales, March 29, 1815. He was educated at a grammar school at Bath, and at the age of 17 entered Haileybury, where he distinguished himself as a scholar, and at the end of 1833 he passed from it as its foremost student into the service of the East India Company. On his journey out he made use of the overland route, then attended with many difficulties and dangers, and after several adventures reached Bombay, September 23, 1834. After passing his examination in Hindustani he was sent by Lord Clare, the Governor of Bombay, to Poona, where he employed his leisure in studying at their seat of government the history and character of the Mahratta people, in whose language he had

already made himself fluent. Attached to the Revenue Department, under Mr. Goldsmid, he assisted that officer in his efforts to improve the system of collecting the taxes then in vogue among a long-oppressed people. During this period he lived in the very heart of the Mahratta country, and under precisely the same conditions as if he had been a native official and not a member of a ruling caste. By this means he acquired an intimate acquaintance with the Mahratta people, which made him unquestionably the greatest authority on the subject. His Mahratta experiences closed the first period of his Indian career. The results attained by him and his associates were so successful that their system was forthwith adopted and applied in the rest of the Bombay Presidency, and eventually in Mysore, Scinde, and Berar. The effect on the people was almost magical. As Mr. Frere himself wrote some years later, "from being the most wretched, depressed set in the Deccan, they have become thriving independent fellows, thoroughly grateful for what has been done for them." The second period of his public life began with his appointment as private secretary to Sir George Arthur, the Governor of Bombay. He obtained this post unexpectedly through the death of the gentleman appointed on his way out from England. It was one for which his tact, courtesy, and conciliatory manners pre-eminently fitted him.

In 1847 he was appointed Resident at Sattara, and soon afterwards, owing to political changes, the appointment was changed from that of Resident to Commissioner. Mr. Frere remained more than two years at Sattara, and in 1850 he was transferred to Scinde as Chief Commissioner, in succession to its conqueror, Sir Charles Napier. In Scinde, a barren tract of country through which the Indus passes without fertilising it, Mr. Frere threw himself with all his energies into the work of improving the communications, constructing the canals, and establishing a great seaport at Kurrachee as the most convenient outlet for the resources of the province.

In 1857 he took a prominent part in the work of suppressing the Indian Mutiny. With admirable prescience he realised that everything depended on the preservation of tranquillity in the Punjab and the ultimate recovery of Delhi. Although the population of Scinde included two million Mahomedans, to keep this large number in order he had only two weak European regiments, four

native regiments, the Scinde horse, some native artillery, a troop of horse artillery, and a mutinous cavalry regiment. Most men would have thought that the Europeans were far too few to keep the natives in order. Mr. Frere decided to send off the strongest of his English regiments without delay to Moultan, a measure which secured that strong fortress throughout the worst days of the Mutiny. He followed up this statesman-like act with many others as an administrator scarcely less remarkable or worthy of praise in their way. He repressed three distinct attempts to mutiny among his native troops. Having purged their ranks of traitors and restored some sense of discipline, he dispatched one Beloochee regiment to the Punjab, and some of his artillery to Central India. It was then he wrote the famous sentence to Lord Elphinstone that "when the head and heart are threatened, the extremities must take care of themselves." Such service rendered in such graceful not less than efficient manner called for special recognition. He twice received the thanks of Parliament; he was made a K.C.B.; and one of his former chiefs, Lord Falkland, extolled the merits of twenty-five years' service among the peoples of India, of which his own countrymen had been ignorant. After the close of the Mutiny Mr. Frere was nominated to the Viceroy's Council, and left Scinde for Calcutta. As might be considered inevitable, after so great a crisis, the state of affairs at head-quarters was one of confusion and disorganisation. In no department were these more painfully apparent than in that of the finances. A trained and experienced financier, Mr. James Wilson, was sent out from England for the express purpose of arranging the taxes and the expenditure on a firm and equitable basis. Sir Bartle Frere assisted him in all his investigations and propositions from the abundant stores of his information, and approved the remedies he suggested, not because they were above all criticism, but because "the risk involved was as nothing compared with the certain ruin of drifting into bankruptcy by remaining as we are." On Mr. Wilson's death Sir Bartle Frere assumed for a time the personal discharge of the duties of Finance Minister, and when Mr. Samuel Laing arrived he entered into the same hearty co-operation with him in his difficult task as with his predecessor. He also devoted himself to the work of restoring, as far as he possibly could, the social relations between

Europeans and natives which had been violently cut off by the events of the Mutiny.

In 1862 he was appointed Governor of Bombay, and while holding this office Sir Bartle devoted himself to every object calculated to improve the condition of the people or to increase the prosperity of the great presidency entrusted to his charge. In all this good work he found an able and energetic colleague in his wife, and Lady Frere was among the very first English ladies to devote time and attention to the question of female education. He founded more public buildings and started more works of public utility than any of his predecessors. He gave Bombay a municipality. During his government the death-rate of Bombay was reduced to almost one-half of what it had been. He was at Bombay during the height of the great cotton fever, and he controlled affairs during the crisis which followed in its fortunes after the close of the American Civil War. He returned to England in 1867, when he was appointed on the first vacancy a member of the Indian Council.

In October 1872 he was sent as Special Commissioner to the East Coast of Africa, where he negotiated an important treaty with the Sultan of Zanzibar, and on his return he was appointed to accompany the Prince of Wales on his tour through India. In 1877 he was appointed Governor of Cape Colony, and in 1878 he sent an ultimatum to the Zulu King Cetshwayo, which resulted in the Zulu war of 1879. Sir Bartle failed to gain either public or official approval of his South African policy, and though he maintained to the last the conviction that it was sound and just, his last years were passed under the clouds of unpopularity. It is as an Anglo-Indian statesman and administrator, however, that Sir Bartle Frere will be permanently remembered, and in that capacity it will be difficult even for his enemies to deny him a place beside his great rival and contemporary, John Lawrence, and among that galaxy of Englishmen who have made the government of India the most remarkable achievement of an alien government recorded in history. He died at his residence, Wressell Lodge, Wimbledon, May 29.

Midhat Pasha, who died early in the month of May, was the son of a Turkish civil judge, and was born at Constantinople in 1822. In 1845 he

was appointed secretary to a commission sanctioned by the then Sultan for the amelioration of the districts about Konieh. He gave much satisfaction, and suddenly found himself promoted to the office of Chief Director of Confidential Reports. He was then despatched to the Asiatic provinces to inquire into the collection of taxes and their appropriation. An outbreak of brigandage in Roumelia occurring, he was despatched to put it down, and this work he accomplished with almost Cromwellian vigour. Returning to receive the congratulations of the Sultan and an appointment to the Supreme Council, he soon once more went into the provinces, this time as Governor of Bulgaria. Here he found even then, some time after the close of the Crimean war, symptoms of rebellion, which he crushed out. Midhat was now ambitious, and he visited several European capitals, apparently with some idea of studying constitutional reforms. His excursion was not fruitless, for on his return home various improvements were made in particular districts, and ultimately Midhat Pasha—for he had in 1860 attained that dignity—induced the Sultan to extend the reforms to the Empire at large. This was the beginning of Midhat's public career, for he now became known to Europe as a Turkish statesman above the common order. He had a marked influence in the framing of the Law of the Vilayets. He was appointed to the Governorship of the Vilayet of the Danube, and in 1864 he began the almost hopeless task of reconciling the Bulgarians to Ottoman supremacy. He constructed many great public works, which remain, under altered circumstances, to testify to the vigour and spirit of Midhat's enterprise. In 1866, however, he was recalled, and appointed to preside over the Council of State. Here he also showed reforming zeal, but a fresh outbreak in Bulgaria arising, he had to return there to suppress the revolt, which he did, as usual, with much resolution. Bagdad next rebelling, Midhat was forthwith despatched to quell the disturbance, and in the end, though not without much effort, he again succeeded. Coming once more to the capital, he took the liberty to warn Abdul Aziz of the danger of an attempt, then being made, to change the succession to the throne. He denounced the Grand Vizier and his colleagues as traitors, and after a violent Court scandal Midhat himself was appointed to succeed Mahmoud Nedim, whom he had denounced. His

triumph, however, was short-lived. Palace intrigue soon mastered the daring reformer, and in a short time his enemies had the pleasure of seeing him vanish to Salonica. From 1875 his career was a series of strange, almost romantic adventures. He took an active part in the deposing of the Sultan Abdul Aziz, and his forcible removal across the Golden Horn to the old Seraglio, where he met his death shortly afterwards. On the accession of Abdul Hamid he was once more Grand Vizier, and the Ottoman Parliament was duly inaugurated with a great flourish. Midhat at once fell under suspicion, and he was not only dismissed, but banished. He then paid a visit to England, soon after the Berlin Treaty was concluded, and was a frequent visitor to the House of Commons, where he carefully studied the procedure of that assembly. His little, agile form was frequently to be seen in the lobby and elsewhere, and he cherished the ambition that he was learning something which he might usefully apply to his native land. A dark cloud, however, was even then hanging over him; but he gave those with whom he came in contact in English society the decided impression that he was a man incapable of bearing any part in the odious crime of complicity in the murder of the Sultan for which he was condemned.

Major-General St. George Mervyn Nugent.—This gallant and distinguished

officer entered the army as ensign in the 29th Regiment in 1842. He was subsequently promoted to the respective ranks of lieutenant and captain in the same regiment. In this corps he served in the Sutlej campaign against the Sikhs, in 1845. He fought in the bloody but glorious victories of Ferozeshah, Moodkee, and Sobraon, for which he received a medal and clasp. In this last battle Lieutenant Nugent was very severely wounded. He afterwards exchanged into the 96th, and, returning home, he resolved to join the Staff College at Sandhurst. In 1858 he was appointed Brigade-Major at Aldershot. In 1861 he was appointed Quartermaster-General of the Army in North America. In 1867 he returned home, and was appointed Assistant Quartermaster-General for Dublin district. After serving as such for a year he was further promoted to be Assistant Quartermaster-General for Ireland. In 1875 he was promoted to the rank of colonel in the army. His next appointment was as Deputy Adjutant-General, Quartermaster-General, and Chief of the Staff in Malta. In 1878 Colonel Nugent was compelled by ill-health to relinquish his important post, but recovering somewhat, he was appointed Deputy Adjutant-General of the North British District, a post which continued till ill-health compelled him to resign in 1879. In 1881 he retired from the army on a pension, with the honorary rank of major-general. He died on May 29.

During the month the following deaths also took place:—On May 1, at Dziouma, in the province of Kharkoff, aged 83, **Baron Andrew Resen**, one of the last of the Dekobrist conspirators against the Emperor Nicholas. After his pardon by the late Emperor Alexander he lived quietly on his property. On May 3, at Prague, **The Empress Anna of Austria**, who was the daughter of the late Victor Emmanuel I., King of Sardinia. She was born on September 19, 1803, was married on February 27, 1831, to the Archduke Ferdinand, and was crowned Queen of Bohemia on September 12, 1836. On May 3, at Brussels, **M. Vandensweep**, administrator; President of the Belgian State Railways. On May 8, in Paris, aged 88, **Prince Michael Stourdza**, who was from 1834 to 1849 Hospodar of Moldavia. When in 1849 the Hospodarate was limited by Russia and Turkey to seven years, he resigned, and retired to France. On May 8, aged 69, **Rev. Edward Halifax Hansell, B.D.**, rector of East Ilsley, Berkshire, formerly Praelector of Theology at Magdalen College, Oxford, where he was some time Fellow, Tutor, and Mathematical Lecturer. On May 9, aged 70, **Giovanni Preti**, an Italian poet. He was made a Senator in 1876, and he filled several important posts in the Ministry of Public Instruction, but he will be best known by his poems. On May 9, at the Lodge, Eton College, aged 71, **The Rev. Charles Old Goodford, D.D.** The son of the late Mr John Goodford, of Chilton Cantilo, Ilchester, Somerset, he was educated as a collegier at Eton, and was for some years an assistant master there. In 1853 he became head master, and was in 1862 promoted to the Provostship, on the death of Dr. Hawtreay. He held the family living of Chilton Cantilo, and was a magistrate for Somersetshire. On May 10, **Rev. Francis Garden, M.A.**, Sub-Dean of the Chapels Royal, which appointment he had held since 1859. He contributed various articles to magazines, and was the author of "An Outline of Logic," and a "Dictionary of English Philosophical Terms." On May 12, at Paris, aged 67, **M. Wurtz**, the eminent French chemist and Republican Life

Senator, the author of numerous works on chemistry, which are of high value to the students of that science. On May 12, at Colwyn Bay, aged 67, **Dr. Robert Angus Smith, F.R.S., F.C.S., Ph.D.**, of Manchester, who was the author of several works upon the air of towns, and a contributor to the Chemical Society's Journal. He had studied chemistry under Liebig, at Giessen. On May 13, at Chicago, aged 75, **Hon. Cyrus M'Cormick**, an American millionaire. A member of an old Virginian family of Scotch extraction, he early in life quitted Virginia for Chicago, with his brother, and established there the widely-known Reaper works. On May 23, at St. Leonards-on-Sea, aged 53, **Major-General Augustus Arthur Currie, C.B.**, son of John Currie, some time M.P. for Hertford. He entered the Bengal Army in 1849, and served in the Indian Mutiny campaign, in the Abyssinian war, and in the Cabul campaign of 1878-9. On May 24, at Ruabon Vicarage, aged 47, **The Very Rev. Henry T. Edwards, M.A.**, Dean of Bangor, an able preacher in English and Welsh, and the author of several publications in both languages. On May 28, aged 74, **Count Joseph Othenin d'Haussonville**, a Senator, and a member of the French Academy. He began life in the diplomatic service. Entering the Chamber of Deputies in 1842, he adopted the principles of the Revolution, and laboured to establish constitutional monarchy in his country. He was a strong anti-Bonapartist, and was well known for his works on French history, and for his essays, which first appeared in the *Revue des Deux-Mondes*. On May 31, at Berlin, **Dr. Henry Bethel Strousberg**. Born of poor Jewish parents in East Prussia, he emigrated to London, and became a writer there upon art journals. Embarking later in extensive railway and mining operations, he made enormous sums of money, until fortune deserted him, and he became bankrupt, and after suffering a year's imprisonment, died in poverty.

JUNE.

Lord Claud Hamilton.—The younger son of James Viscount Hamilton, eldest son of the first Marquess of Hamilton by his wife Harriett, daughter of the Hon. John Douglas, son of James fifteenth earl of Merton, was born July 27th, 1813. He was educated at Harrow and at Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1844 he married Lady Elizabeth Emma Proby, second daughter of Granville Leveson, third Earl of Carysfort, by whom he had issue one son and three daughters. He represented the county of Tyrone in the Conservative interest from 1835 to 1837, and again from 1839 to 1874. In 1852 he was appointed Treasurer of the Queen's Household and Privy Councillor, and he was Vice Chamberlain from July 1866 to December 1868. He died in Portland Place on June 3.

The Prince of Orange.—Alexander Prince of Orange, who died June 21, was born in 1851. He was the second son of the King of Holland, but became

heir to the throne on the death of his elder brother in 1879. An invalid from the days of his infancy, the greater part of his life was spent in close seclusion and retirement. He was an earnest student and a great lover of natural history, ornithology being his favourite pursuit. His appearances in public were very rare, but he used to attend Masonic meetings, and in 1877 he presided over the conference held at the Hague to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the death of Spinoza. On this occasion he delivered an eloquent address, so remarkable for the learning and breadth of thought it displayed as to excite the admiration of all the members of the conference, and to draw from M. Renan the remark that the prince was a man of refined judgment and a philosopher. The prince was unmarried, and his death left his half-sister Wilhelmina, a child under four years of age, heir-presumptive to the throne of Holland.

Also—On June 1, aged 89, **Bishop Benjamin Bosworth Smith**, the presiding bishop of the American Episcopal Church. He came of the stock of Boswells and Smiths of Rhode Island, who went out in 1620, and have been distinguished in every generation since. He was consecrated first Bishop of Kentucky in 1832, from which position he retired in 1879. On June 2, in St. George's Square, London, aged 75, **John Hinde Palmer, Q.C., M.P.** for Lincoln. The son of Mr. Samuel Palmer of Dulwich, he was called to the Bar, and was the author of a work on "County Reform" and one on the "Church and Education Question." On

June 4, at Farnham House, Cavan, aged 80, **Somerset Richard Maxwell**, Lord Farnham. He succeeded his brother as eighth Baron in 1868, and was the thirteenth in descent from King Henry VII. On June 5, aged 60, **Colonel John Allen Lloyd Phillips**, of Mabws, Cardiganshire, and of Dale Castle, Pembrokehire. The son of the late Major John Phillips Allen Lloyd Phillips of Dale Castle. He was a magistrate and a deputy-lieutenant for the counties of Pembroke and Cardigan, lieutenant-colonel of 5th Brigade of Welsh Division Garrison Artillery, and formerly held a commission in the 82nd foot. He was for many years Provincial Grand Master of Freemasons for the Western Division of South Wales. On June 6, at Handsworth, Birmingham, aged 61, **William Bragge, F.S.A.** He was connected with the remarkable railway extension of 1845, and many of the railways of South America owe their existence to him. He started the manufacture of machine-made watches on the American principle at Birmingham, and left a large collection of curiosities at the disposal of numerous public bodies. On June 7, at Glenberrow, Herefordshire, aged 89, **Hon. Emily Amelia Murray**, who was for twenty years maid of honour to the Queen. She was the daughter of Lord George Murray, Bishop of St. Davids, and the author of some "Recollections." On June 7, in Warwick Square, London, aged 70, **Major-General Daniel Henry Mackinnon**, who was son of the late Daniel Mackinnon, of Binfield, Berks, and the grandson of the thirty-second chief of the clan. He went to India with the 16th Lancers, and served in the Afghanistan campaign under Lord Keane, and was the author of works on military service in the East. On June 10, at Cairo, aged 53, **Edward Thomas Rogers (Rogers Bey)**, who, entering the Consular Service in 1848, was employed in different places in the East, until he became consul at Cairo. On that consulate being abolished, he retired from the service, and was for some time agent to the Egyptian Government in London, and subsequently entered the service of the Egyptian Government in the Education Department. On June 11, at Brighton, aged 73, **General Sir Edward Warde, K.C.B.**, of the Horse Artillery. The son of the late General Sir Henry Warde, G.C.B. He served in the Crimean war, and commanded the artillery at Aldershot on the formation of that camp; also in the South-Western District, and at Woolwich. On June 11, aged 79, **Rev. William Gaskell**, the husband of the authoress Mrs. Gaskell, and himself the author of many theological works, and of a remarkable article in the *National Review* (1860), entitled "The Religious Heresies of the Working Classes." He was minister of the Unitarian Chapel at Manchester since 1828. On June 11, at Baden, near Vienna, aged nearly 90, **Herr Adolph Pollack Ritter von Rudin**, one of the greatest manufacturers of lucifer matches in the world. He established factories at Prague, Vienna, and Budweis, and warehouses at London, New York, Sydney, and Yokohama. His charities were very munificent. On June 15, at Lichfield, aged 63, **William Bromley Davenport**, M.P. for Northern Division of Warwickshire. The son of the late Rev. Walter Davenport Bromley, who in 1822 assumed the additional name of Bromley, he was a magistrate, and deputy-lieutenant for Staffordshire and Warwickshire, and owned the estate of Baginton Hall, near Coventry. His death occurred suddenly, from heart disease, whilst endeavouring to quell a disturbance amongst the Royal Staffordshire Yeomanry, of which regiment he was colonel. On June 16, in Paris, aged 80, **M. Maret**, titular Archbishop of Lepanto, the head of the Roman Catholic Faculty at the Sorbonne. He declared against Infallibility in 1869, and wrote treatises in defence of Gallican principles. On June 23, at Coombe, Surrey, aged 63, **Rev. James Baldwin Brown**, minister of Brixton Independent Chapel. This eminent Nonconformist preacher was the son of Dr. James Baldwin Brown, a barrister, and was himself intended for the Bar. He kept his terms, but before being called, he entered a theological college, and accepted a pastorate at Derby. After two years' stay he removed to London, where he spent the remainder of his life. He was an eloquent preacher, the author of numerous well-known theological works, and throughout his life a staunch defender of freedom of thought. In 1878 he was chosen Chairman of the Congregational Union. On June 25, in Chesham Street, aged 82, **Right Hon. Philip Yorke Gore, J.P.**, fourth Earl of Arran, K.P. He was for some years in the Diplomatic Service. On June 26, at the Inns of Court Hotel, aged 61, **Charles George Merewether, Q.C.**, Recorder of Leicester, sometime M.P. for Northampton. The son of the late Rev. Francis Merewether, Rector of Cole-Orton, and Vicar of Whitwick, Leicestershire, he was called to the Bar in 1848, and became a Q.C. in 1877, and had been for some years a Bencher of the Inner Temple. On June 27, in Park Street, aged 50, **Percy Mitford**, son of the late Henry Revely Mitford, of Esbury. Early in life he

entered the army, but he afterwards passed into the diplomatic service, and was attached to the legations at Dresden, Berlin, and Brussels, subsequently becoming secretary at Copenhagen, Frankfurt, and Berlin. On June 29, at St. Leonard's Lodge, Windsor, aged 64, **Rev. Henry Mildred Birch, B.D.**, Canon of Ripon. The son of the late Rev. Henry William Rous Birch, Rector of Reydoncum-Southwold, and Bedford, Suffolk, he was educated at Eton, and at King's College, Cambridge, where he was formerly a Fellow. He was Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, Chaplain to the Prince of Wales, to whom he was for some time tutor, Rural Dean of Prestwich and Middleton, and was Rector of Prestwich, Manchester, until his resignation.

JULY.

General Count Todleben.—Franz-Edward Todleben, whose death took place July 1, at Soden (a watering-place near Wiesbaden), after a prolonged illness, was born at Mitau, in Courland, on May 20, 1818. The son of a tradesman, he was sent to school in Riga, and was afterwards admitted a student of the Institute of Engineers at St. Petersburg, where his name is now to be seen in letters of gold, with the inscription "Sebastopol, 1854-5." He entered the army in due course, but at first his promotion was not rapid. He took part in the expedition to the Caucasus in the years 1847-50, and had his first experience of practical military engineering in the siege of some of the strong places of the mountaineers. On the outbreak of the war between Russia and Turkey in 1853 he was first attached as Adlatus to General Schildner-Schuldner, and took a prominent part in the unsuccessful siege of Silistria. The ability he displayed, however, caused him to be entrusted with the defence of Sebastopol when the allied forces invaded the Crimea in 1854. Powerfully defended on the seaward approach, this city was practically open on the land side, and it has been generally believed, that when the allies marched upon it after the battle of the Alma, it might have been taken at once by an assault. The favourable moment, however, was allowed to pass, and once lost, it did not recur. Under the skilful direction of Todleben in an incredibly short space of time the English and French batteries were confronted by earthworks of the most formidable kind. The round white stone tower, which had been the chief and almost the only landward defence, was quickly surrounded with earthworks, at which men, women, and children were seen to be labouring day and night, and the tower itself was rapidly connected by a line of earthworks with a strong redoubt on the right, afterwards well

known as the Redan. Batteries—especially those which are still remembered under the names of the "Barrack," "Garden," and "Flagstaff" batteries—were soon in position, and every day added to their strength and number. These defences were so well devised and maintained that the Russians succeeded in keeping the powerful allied armies and fleets at bay from October 1854 to September 1855; and even after the Malakhoff had been taken and the town nearly destroyed by the bombardment they were able to withdraw their army to the northern side almost with no loss. During the year, Todleben, who had planned and conducted the whole defence, passed by rapid steps from the grade of captain to that of major-general, and received the high decoration of St. Andrew. He did not, however, pass through the siege unharmed, for on June 20, 1855, he was severely wounded in the foot. He was, however, able to superintend the defences of Nicolaieff and to inspect and strengthen those of Cronstadt before the war ended. At its close he was appointed general-adjutant to the Emperor Alexander II., and received the Order of St. George and a grant of money. He visited Germany in 1856, and inspected the principal fortresses. In the same year he came to England, where he was very cordially received. In 1860 he was made lieutenant-general, chief of the Department of Engineers at the Russian Ministry of War, and assistant to the Grand Duke Nicholas. These offices he retained until the Russo-Turkish war of 1877, when he again came to the front. During the early stages of the war he was not entrusted with any command, but he was called upon to save the honour and credit of the Russian army, which stood baffled and defeated before the defences of Plevna. Three times had they been repulsed with great slaughter, on July 20, July 31, and

September 11, 1877, and both the Russians themselves and skilled observers all over the world began to talk of a retreat across the Danube, a *levée en masse*, and a second campaign. Then it was that the Emperor and the incompetent Court generals around him remembered that the Russian army contained a man who might yet save them, one of the greatest engineer-officers in the world. They sent for Todleben, who was living, if not in disgrace, at least outside the sunshine of Imperial favour. He was bidden to invest Plevna. He arrived on September 28, and at once began regular siege operations. Osman had been virtualled from Sofia; but after the beginning of November he received no more supplies. By that time he was completely invested; Gourko and his cavalry blocked the roads; he could neither get out nor could food come to him. No Turkish army came to his relief. He determined to make the attempt to break out, and made it on the night of December 9, with 32,000 men. But after a gallant struggle his men began to lay down their arms, and he surrendered. He and his men were marched through the snow to the Danube, many thousands dying on the way. General Todleben had thus shown himself to be indispensable, and accordingly, after the deficiencies of the Grand Duke Nicholas had been still further proved by the events of the winter and the spring, he was appointed, in April 1878, commander-in-chief of the Russian army of Bulgaria. It was under his command that the advance upon Constantinople was made; and after the signature of the Treaty of San Stefano, and, in fact, till the evacuation of Turkish territory was completed, he remained at Adrianople as administrator-in-chief of the occupied provinces. In 1879 he was appointed governor-general of Odessa, with extraordinary powers against the Nihilists. There was some talk, after the first battle of Geok Tepé, of sending him into Central Asia; but this command was ultimately given to his brilliant junior, General Skobelev. For the last four years General Todleben—who was made a count after the events of 1877-78—lived in comparative retirement, his health having greatly failed.

Dr. Jacobson, formerly Bishop of Chester.—The Right Rev. William Jacobson, D.D., who died at the palace, Chester, July 13, and who had resigned the bishopric of Chester in the begin-

ning of the year, was born in 1803, his father, a mercantile clerk at Yarmouth, being lost at sea during his infancy. He was brought up as a Nonconformist, and was educated at Homerton College under Dr. Pye Smith, and at Mill Hill College, Birmingham, for the Dissenting ministry. A change in his ecclesiastical views caused him to go to Oxford to study for the ministry of the Church of England, which he subsequently entered. He became a Fellow of Exeter College in 1829, within two years after taking his degree, and from 1832 to 1848 he was vice-principal of Magdalen Hall, a society of which he was the mainstay during the whole period of his connection with it. Dr. Macbride, a theologian of some note and weight in the Evangelical party albeit a layman, was the principal, but Dr. Jacobson was tutor, and numbered some very distinguished men, including Mr. Delane, afterwards editor of the *Times*, and his brother-in-law, Sir George Dasent, among his pupils. Among his earlier friends at Exeter was the late Frederick Denison Maurice, who had migrated from Cambridge to Oxford in 1830, and was indebted to Dr. Jacobson for timely pecuniary aid, proffered with the utmost delicacy and good feeling at a critical period of his life. In 1848 Dr. Jacobson, who had held the office of public orator for six years, was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity. To this chair was attached a canonry at Christ Church, and also at that time and for some years afterwards the rectory of Ewelme in Oxfordshire. Dr. Jacobson was Regius Professor till 1865. His lectures were remarkable rather for solidity than brilliancy, and the honourable epithet of "Judicious," which belongs of right to a father of the English Church, would probably best represent the impression he made on the successive generations of candidates for Holy Orders who attended his lectures in the Latin Chapel of the Cathedral. In 1865, on the death of Dr. Graham, he was nominated by Lord Palmerston to the see of Chester. A man of scholarly and studious habits, he proved to be an administrator gifted with moderation, discretion, and tact; while the subdivision of his see and the creation and endowment of the bishopric of Liverpool is sufficient evidence of his energy and ability. In 1867, on the death of Dr. Wigram, Bishop of Rochester, he obtained a seat in the House of Lords. Among his works were the Oxford paraphrase and annotations upon all the Epistles of St. Paul, and fragmentary

illustrations of the history of the Book of Common Prayer. During the last few years his health failed, and, being in his eighty-first year, he thought it right to resign.

Earl Cowley, K.G.—The Right Hon. Henry Richard Charles Wellesley, K.G., G.C.B., was born June 17, 1804. His father was the third son of the first Earl of Mornington; was created Baron Cowley in 1828, in recognition of his distinguished diplomatic services. The whole of Lord Cowley's life, from his twentieth year until his final retirement in 1867, was spent in the diplomatic service. He first became an attaché at Vienna in 1824. He served successively in different capacities and grades at the Hague, Stuttgart, Constantinople, Berne, and Frankfurt; and on February 15, 1853, having been made, two days previously, a Privy Councillor, he was appointed Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the French Republic, a post which he continued to occupy when the Republic was transformed into the Empire, and which he never quitted, except on occasional leave of absence, until his final retirement in 1867. The history of Lord Cowley's Embassy at Paris is the history of the Second Empire in its relations with this country. Lord Cowley went to Paris a little more than two months after the *Coup d'État*, and he finally quitted it just three years before the declaration of war in 1870 between France and Prussia. In those fifteen years he was a witness and an actor in some of the most momentous events of modern history, in connection with which his tact, courtesy, and ability proved of the highest service to his country. There were not wanting occasions between 1852 and 1867 when a lack of discretion, good sense, and forbearance on the part of the British Ambassador might easily have endangered the peaceful relations of the two countries. Throughout the Crimean war, and the negotiations which preceded and followed it, Lord Cowley's task can have been no light one. An offensive and defensive alliance between the two Western Powers had to be arranged, a joint plan of operations had to be concerted, divergencies of policy and purpose had to be avoided, and when success was achieved, after many disappointments and miscarriages, Lord Cowley was called upon to take his place with Lord Clarendon as one of the English Plenipotentiaries at the Congress of the European Powers which

concluded the Treaty of Paris in 1856. In the following year he was sole British Plenipotentiary for the conclusion of the peace with Persia, also signed at Paris. Again in 1858 he had a trying part to play in connection with the excitement caused in France and England by the attempt of Orsini on the life of the Emperor Napoleon, and the following year was despatched on a special mission to Vienna for the purpose of mediating between Austria and France in reference to the affairs of Italy. His mediation was unsuccessful, however; war broke out in the spring, and its sequel in the following year was that cession of Savoy and Nice to France which caused so much irritation in England. The volunteer movement had been initiated in 1859 as a sort of national protest against the aggressive policy attributed to the French Emperor. But the good-will of the Government, the good sense of the nation, and, no doubt, the tact and discretion of Lord Cowley sufficed to allay irritation, to restrain suspicion and to maintain unimpaired the friendly relations of the two countries in spite of exasperating circumstances. Early in 1860 Lord Cowley had been appointed joint Plenipotentiary with Mr. Cobden for the negotiation of a treaty of commerce between France and England. The treaty was signed on January 23, 1860, and from that time forward the relations between the two countries were established and maintained on a footing of friendship sufficiently strong to resist the shock subsequently inflicted on it by the discovery of the cession of Savoy and Nice. Among the other events of importance which occurred during the period of Lord Cowley's embassy may be mentioned the abortive proposals for a European congress made by the Emperor Napoleon in 1863—proposals rendered abortive mainly by the refusal of Earl Russell as Foreign Secretary to accede to them—the Danish war of the following year, the Mexican Expedition and its disastrous sequel in the execution of the Emperor Maximilian, the negotiations concerning Luxembourg, and last, but not least, the Austro-Prussian war of 1866; each of these events, or series of events, affected more or less directly the relations of England and France, and imposed heavy labours and responsibilities on the British representative in Paris. It may be noticed as a final incident in Lord Cowley's diplomatic career that the authentic news of Maximilian's tragic death reached Europe on the very day that

Lord Cowley took leave of his diplomatic colleagues in Paris. Lord Cowley married, in 1833, the Hon. Olivia Cecilia Fitzgerald de Ros, second daughter of the late Lord Henry Fitzgerald and Charlotte Baroness de Ros. He succeeded his father as Baron Cowley in 1847, his title being raised to that of Earl in 1847, and he was made a Knight of the Garter in 1866. He died at his residence, Albemarle Street, July 15, within two days of completing his eightieth year.

Mr. Justice Williams.—Sir Charles James Watkin Williams was the eldest son of the late Rev. Peter Williams, rector of Llansannan, Denbighshire, by his marriage with Lydia Sophia, daughter of the Rev. James Price, of Plas-yn-Llysfan, in that county, and was born on September 23, 1828. He was educated at the grammar school at Ruthin, went as a gentleman commoner to St. Mary Hall, Oxford, proceeded to the London University, and studied medicine under Mr. Erichsen, afterwards the distinguished president of the College of Surgeons. Relinquishing medicine, he entered the Inner Temple as a law student in 1851. Called to the Bar in 1854, he practised as a special pleader, wrote a very clear and useful work on pleading and procedure (published in 1856, but post-dated 1857 according to a common device), and got so soon into practice that in 1859 he was nominated "tubman" of the Court of Exchequer, a mysterious dignity, connected apparently with the jurisdiction of the Court over wines and beers, and the Sovereign's revenue therefrom, and in modern times valuable from the seat and a certain right of audience which the possessor enjoyed. "Silk" Mr. Williams did not take till 1873. He went the Home Circuit, afterwards the South-Eastern, and was made a Bencher in 1873. Meanwhile, and while still a stuff-gownsmen, he had been elected to Parliament by his early friends and neighbours, the constituency of the Denbigh district. He sat for this group of towns from 1868 to 1880. He then left them for a few months to become member for the county of Carnarvon, in which he had gone to reside, and only resigned that seat on becoming a Judge in November 1880. His position in Parliament was that of an avowed Liberal. He supported disestablishment in Ireland, and wished to extend the same measure to Wales. One of his most conspicuous services in Parlia-

ment was as a member of the Committee on Foreign Loans in 1875. Sir Henry James had obtained the appointment of this committee to inquire into the transactions by which the Honduras loans and other worthless issues were foisted upon unfortunate investors. Mr. Watkin Williams, by his intimate acquaintance with mercantile business and the skill and fairness of his method of examining witnesses, was able to second powerfully the exertions of the Attorney-General, and aided the other members of the committee to expose some of the most scandalous of financial frauds. On taking his seat upon the judicial bench, he immediately became the advocate before the Council of Judges of the change which was subsequently made in the direction of simplifying the Court by abolishing the distinction between Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer; he also urged the removal of the distinction between the Chancery Division and the Queen's Bench, but deprecated the abolition of the offices of Chief Justice of the Common Pleas and Lord Chief Baron, on the ground that the prizes of the Bench should be increased rather than diminished. Mr. Williams's opinions at the Bar had always been valued, not only for their learning and accuracy but also for the decision with which he recommended the course he saw reason to prefer. On the Bench he took the same pains with the consideration of difficult questions. Sir W. Williams married, in 1855, Henrietta, daughter of the late Mr. William Henry Carey, a niece of Vice-chancellor Malins. She died in 1864, and he afterwards married Elizabeth, daughter of the late Lord Justice Lush. His death took place suddenly at Nottingham, where he had gone with Mr. Justice Lopes to hold the summer assizes, July 17.

Rev. Mark Pattison.—The Rev. Mark Pattison, Rector of Lincoln, was born in 1813, at Hornby, in Yorkshire, and was the son of the Rev. Mark James Pattison, Rector of Hawkswell. He entered at Oriel College, Oxford, in 1831, and took his degree in 1836. In 1840 Pattison was elected to a Fellowship at Lincoln College. In 1841 Tract XC. was published. In the same year Pattison was ordained deacon, and at that time he frequently assisted Newman at St. Mary's. In 1843, the year when Pattison was ordained priest, Newman resigned St. Mary's; and in 1846, when the end came and Newman quitted Oxford "for good," as he phrased

it himself, Pattison was among the few devoted friends admitted to bid him farewell. After the withdrawal of Newman his connection with the Tractarian party was gradually, and in time completely, severed. In 1841 and 1843 he obtained the Denyer Theological Prize, the subject of his essays being "The Sufficiency of Holy Scripture for the Salvation of Man" and "Original or Birth Sin and the necessity of New Birth unto Life." But his interest in dogmatic theology was soon to pale before the attractions of philosophy and general literature. Though for many years he published little with his name, yet his range of studies was vast and his literary activity was considerable. He was soon recognised as an authority of weight on educational matters, and his evidence, given before the first University Commission, afforded a public proof of the profound attention he had given to the history of learning and the theory of its organisation. His views on the subject were far in advance of the time, and it was not until almost another generation had passed that they began to bear practical fruit. He was appointed Classical Examiner first in 1848 and again in 1853, when the new Examination Statute of 1851 first came into operation. In 1855 the first Oxford Reform Act had been passed, and Pattison seized the opportunity to review the situation in a masterly paper contributed to the "Oxford Essays" of that year. In 1851 he was an unsuccessful

candidate for the rectorship of his college, but in 1861 he won the prize for which he had unsuccessfully contended ten years previously. In the following year he married a daughter of Captain Strong, a retired officer of the Indian Army. Mrs. Pattison, who was several years younger than the rector, was nevertheless well qualified both by taste and education to share his literary interests. Among the best-known of the works of Pattison are his biography of "Isaac Casaubon," published in 1875, his monograph on "Milton" in the *Eminent Men of Letters* series, and his edition of "Milton's Sonnets." To the *Quarterly Reviews* he was a frequent contributor, as well as to the *Fortnightly Review*, the *Nineteenth Century*, and other magazines of the same type. He contributed also in his own name to the *Academy*, where his reviews of Newman's "Grammar of Assent" and of Mozley's "Reminiscences" were invested with a rare personal interest, and for many years he wrote in the *Saturday Review*. Standing in the first rank of true scholars in range of study and amplitude of learning, he had very few rivals among his contemporaries, and fewer still perhaps in that maturity of judgment, that comprehensive breadth of view, which are the notes not merely of profound knowledge, but of the truly philosophic mind. His autobiographical memoirs, published shortly after his death, give a curious insight into his life.

During the month the following deaths also took place:—On July 4, at his residence in Portland Place, the Right Hon. William Bernard Petre, twelfth Lord Petre, of Writtle, Essex. He was born at Thorndon Hall, Essex, on December 20, 1817, and succeeded to the title on the death of his father in 1850. He long held a foremost place among the laity of the Roman Catholic Church in England, by whom he was highly respected. He had always taken a deep interest in the cause of education, and in the spread of the faith which he had inherited from his ancestors, and to which he was devotedly attached. On July 6, at Barmouth, South Wales, aged 74, Dr. George Alfred Walker, M.R.C.S., L.S.A., well known as "Graveyard" Walker, on account of his services to the country as a sanitary reformer, more particularly in his crusade against intra-mural interments, on which subject he wrote and published several works. On July 9, in Portman Square, Emma, Lady Dymoke, widow of the late Sir Henry Dymoke, Bart., of Scrivelsby, Lincolnshire, Hereditary Champion of England, and some time vice-lieutenant of the county of Lincoln. She was the daughter of William Pearce, of Billingford, Norfolk. On July 10, at Berlin, aged 73, Professor Kahl Richard Lepsius, keeper of the Royal Library at Berlin, famous as an Egyptologist. On July 11, at New York, Paul Morphy, the famous chess-player. On July 10, aged 61, Sir Charles Compton William Domville, late of Tantry House, co. Dublin. On July 13, at Paris, aged 81, the Abbé Moisin, well known as a man of science and theologian. He was a writer in newspapers and magazines, was assistant chaplain at a Paris lycée, and was made a canon of St Denis in 1873. On July 14, in Ashley Place, Westminster, aged 67, Vice-Admiral Charles Joseph Ewart, C.B., son of Colonel J. F. Ewart, C.B. He served in the Crimean war, and in 1862 was employed at Cyrene in excavating and conveying marbles to the British

Museum. On July 18, at Lancaster Gate, aged 85, **John Horatio Lloyd**, one of the oldest and most influential members of the legal profession. He was the son of John Lloyd, a banker of Stockport, was called to the Bar in 1826, and represented Stockport in the first reformed Parliament. His name will be permanently associated with "Lloyd's Bonds," securities issued by railroad contractors, or in respect of lines in course of construction. On July 19, in Nottingham Place, aged 79, **Hewitt Davis**, one of the most prominent leaders of the agricultural movement which followed on Liebig's writings upon artificial manures. He was amongst the earliest of the inspectors appointed by the Land Commissioners, under the various Land Improvement Acts. On July 19, at Brescia, aged 76, **Count Giuseppe Martinengo Cesaresco**, one of the last surviving leaders of the Italian movement. He fitted out a troop at his own expense in 1848, which he placed at the disposal of the Governor of Milan. As colonel of the National Guard, he was the leading spirit during the revolutionary period at Brescia, and the last to leave that city after its fall. After many years of exile he returned to Brescia, and was decorated by Victor Emmanuel with the Order of St. Maurice and St. Lazarus. On July 20, in Grosvenor Street, aged 86, **Cesar Hawkins, F.R.S.**, serjeant-surgeon to the Queen, and consulting-surgeon to St. George's Hospital, with which his family had been connected for 160 years. He was the son of Rev. Edward Hawkins, and the grandson of Sir Cesar Hawkins, the first baronet, an eminent surgeon, who was serjeant-surgeon to George II. and George III. On July 22, at Ventnor, Isle of Wight, aged 85, the **Right Hon. Sir Laurence Peel**, son of Mr. Joseph Peel, of Bowes, Middlesex. He was called to the Bar in 1824, and became Advocate-General at Calcutta, and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. He was treasurer of the Middle Temple in 1871, a paid member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, a deputy-lieutenant for the City of London, and honorary D.C.L. of Oxford. On July 24, at Malvern, aged 64, the **Hon. and Rev. Canon Lyttelton**, for thirty-seven years vicar of Hagley, son of the third Baron Lyttelton. He took a warm interest in all educational schemes and subjects. On July 24, at Queen's Gate Terrace, aged 41, **Sir Charles John Forbes**, of Newe and Edinglassie, Aberdeenshire, fourth Bart. His father had preferred his claim to the peerage of Forbes, of Pitsligo, attained in 1746. On July 25, at Wood Green, aged 72, **Mr. George Brettingham Sowerby, F.L.S.** The nephew of the distinguished naturalist, Mr. James Sowerby, he was himself eminent as an artist and as a naturalist. He was a frequent contributor to the proceedings of the Zoological and other learned societies, and was the author of works in various branches of natural history. On July 27, at Tingby, in Denmark, aged 90, the patriotic poetess "**Anna**," of Schleswick-Holstein, whose real name was Madame Anna Kristiana Ludvigsen. On July 29, at Sydney, N.S.W., aged 59, **James Snowden Calvert**, the last survivor of the Leichhardt Australian Exploring Expedition. On July 31, at Lower Grosvenor Place, aged 80, **Charles Manby, F.R.S.**, for forty-five years identified with the Institution of Civil Engineers, of which he was honorary secretary. He was the son of Aaron Manby, the founder of the Horseley Ironworks, of the Paris Gasworks, and of ironworks at Charenton and Creuzot. Mr. Charles Manby was intended for the army, but after working in various parts of the world at his father's contracts, he settled in London as a Civil Engineer.

AUGUST.

Sir William Codrington.—General Sir William Codrington, G.C.B., who died August 6, aged 80, the son of Admiral Sir Edward Codrington, the victor of Navarino, was born in 1804. He entered the Coldstream Guards in 1821, and having risen to the rank of colonel, he went with that regiment to Bulgaria at the beginning of the Russian war. While the troops were at Varna he was promoted to the rank of major-general, and thereby became unattached; but he remained with the army as a volunteer, and when the

expedition to the Crimea was undertaken he was placed by Lord Raglan in charge of the 1st Brigade of the Light Division, then under the command of General Sir George Brown. Codrington landed with his brigade in the Crimea on September 14, 1854, and never quitted the country until it was finally evacuated by the troops under his command on July 12, 1856. The assault on the Russian position at the Alma on September 20 was led by the Light Division, and the brigade commanded by Codrington, consisting of the 7th,

23rd, and 33rd Regiments, was in the foremost and thickest of the fight. The advance was hurried owing to the necessities of the French troops, who had opened the battle and were getting into difficulties, and the Light Division had to make its way under a murderous fire from the enemy through a series of the most formidable obstacles. More than once the men had to lie down to secure a momentary shelter from the Russian fire, but Codrington pushed on, drove the enemy before him, and finally led his men up the slope to the very walls of the redoubt whose fire had commanded and impeded his advance. This redoubt he captured for a time, but he was compelled partially to relinquish his hold until the supports arrived and the battle was finally won. Codrington's share in the action was mentioned with great distinction by Lord Raglan in his despatch describing the battle. Again, at Inkerman, on November 5, Codrington was in the thick of the fight, and was severely wounded; his "admirable behaviour" being again highly commended by the Commander-in-Chief. When Sir George Brown, who was also wounded at Inkerman, retired from the command of the Light Division, Codrington was appointed to succeed him, and in this capacity he organised and superintended the unsuccessful attack on the Redan, on September 8, 1855, when, though the English assault failed, the fall of Sebastopol was secured by the French capture of the Malakoff. The dispositions made by General Simpson on this occasion came in for a good deal of adverse criticism, but no blame was attributed to Sir William Codrington for the miscarriage of the attack, for when General Simpson resigned his command in the following month Codrington was appointed to succeed him. He retained the command-in-chief until the close of the war, and the evacuation of the Crimea was effected under his directions. Quitting England a colonel in 1854, he returned home commander-in-chief in 1856. He was made a K.C.B. during the war, and in 1865 he was nominated G.C.B. In 1863 he was promoted to the full rank of general, and he was governor and commander-in-chief at Gibraltar from 1859 to 1865. In 1860 he was appointed colonel of the 23rd Regiment, which he had led so gallantly in the advance of the Light Brigade at the Alma, and in 1875 he became colonel of the Coldstream Guards, the regiment in which he had held his first commission in 1821. His

successive steps of regimental promotion were obtained in 1826, 1836, and 1846, and in 1854 he attained the rank of major-general. It only remains to add that Sir William Codrington sat in Parliament for two years, from 1857 to 1859, as Liberal member for Greenwich, that he unsuccessfully contested Westminster in 1874 and Lewes at the last general election, and that he was for many years an active member of the Metropolitan Board of Works. He was married in 1836 to a daughter of Mr. Levi Ames, of the Hyde, Hertford.

Sir Erasmus Wilson.—James Erasmus Wilson, President of the Royal College of Surgeons, who died at his residence, the Bungalow, Westgate-on-Sea, August 8, was born in 1809. He studied anatomy and medicine in London and at Aberdeen, and became a member of the Royal College of Surgeons in 1831. His aptitude as a dissector was early recognised as very great, and he was also gifted in an eminent degree with those qualities which make the successful operator—a steady hand, a calm nerve, and a power of acquiring moral ascendancy over his patients. The theoretical anatomist and the expert dissector do not always make good practical surgeons, but Wilson was as sure of himself in the accident ward as in the amphitheatre; and he had another virtue which is not always found mated with manual skill—that is, a strong reluctance to advise amputations unless every hope of saving a limb was gone. Erasmus Wilson's professional beginnings do not seem to have been difficult. He began to practise at a time when surgery, even in civilian life, was still somewhat rough, and especially so in hospitals. He had a gentle, winning manner, which made him friends; and the munificent philanthropy which he was to display in after life, when he became rich, revealed itself by a good deal of unostentatious charity even in the days when he had not much to give away. Then he was an indefatigable worker. He took to writing as a relaxation from his professional business, and while still quite young won considerable repute by his "Dissector's Manual," "The Anatomist's *Vade Mecum*," and other publications, including some elaborate anatomical plates. But Wilson's renown was definitely established when he took skin diseases as his speciality. Doubtless his philanthropy guided him to the study of this most painful, repulsive, and embarrassing class of disease, which at

that time was very prevalent amongst the neglected poor of London. But he had to deal with rich patients as well as poor, and over these the masterful stamp of his mind enabled him to exercise despotism in matters of diet. Wilson was not only a consummate dietician, but he knew how to make his patients submit to have their bodies placed under martial law—which is a very different thing. It is unquestionable that he also knew more about skin diseases than any man of his time. He cured where others had failed to cure; and his works on dermatology, though they met with pretty searching criticism at the time of their appearance, have nearly all maintained their position as text-books. Not content with studying such cases as came under his observation in this country, Wilson visited the East to make himself acquainted with leprosy. He went for his holidays to Switzerland and the Valais to examine gottre, and roamed over Italy with an eye rather to ringworm and the many cutaneous disorders of an ill-fed peasantry than to the artistic beauties of the country. Among the best-known of his works are "The Student's Book of Diseases of the Skin," "A Healthy Skin—a popular treatise on its management," "Report on Leprosy," and the article on "Skin" in Cooper's Surgical Dictionary. Wilson also wrote countless articles and reports for journals of medicine and science, and was for a time correspondent on Surgery to the Academies of Medicine of Paris and Leipsic. Professional honours were lavished on him abundantly in reward of his labours. He became Fellow of the College of Surgeons in 1843, member of the Council in 1870, and President in 1881. In 1869 he founded at his own expense the chair and museum of Dermatology in the College of Surgeons, and was elected the first professor. He also instituted the chair of Pathology in the University of Aberdeen. This brings us to Erasmus Wilson's performances as a philanthropist. He amassed great wealth by his practice and his books, and he gave his money away for charitable objects with a real relish in doing good. In addition to an immense number of private and secretly-bestowed benefactions, he erected a chapel and new wing to the Sea-bathing Infirmary at Margate; he built the Master's house at the Epsom Medical College in 1872; and restored the church of Swanscombe, Kent, in 1873. For these and other similar acts of bounty, which it would require many lines to set forth, Her

Majesty conferred the honour of knighthood on Mr. Wilson in 1881; but by that time Sir Erasmus had earned national fame of a new sort by bringing the obelisk—generally but inaccurately named Cleopatra's Needle—to England. This obelisk was one of two which had long lain in the sands at Alexandria. The French have got one, which has stood in the Champs Élysées since 1836. That which now adorns the Thames Embankment was acquired for Great Britain by Sir Ralph Abercromby in 1801, but it was not removed. It was offered to the British Government by Mehemet Ali in 1840, and again by the Khedive in 1877; but still the British Government did not think it worth while to incur the expense of transport. Erasmus Wilson thought this derogatory to the national dignity, and undertook to have the obelisk brought over at his own cost. This cost amounted to over 10,000*l.*, for the great monolith met with strange adventures on its voyage to England on board the *Cleopatra*. The ship had to be abandoned on the high seas, and six lives were lost in the fruitless attempt to recover it. Eventually it was brought to London, and the obelisk was set on its present eminence in September 1878. Mr. Wilson received very hearty applause from the nation on the occasion of its inauguration. In addition to the honours already enumerated which Sir Erasmus Wilson enjoyed were those of Fellow of the Royal Society, honorary LL.D. of the University of Cambridge, and Vice-President of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, and President of the Egypt Exploration Fund. In 1841 he was married to Miss Doherty, daughter of Mr. James Doherty, but left no issue.

The Earl of Lauderdale.—Charles Barclay Maitland, twelfth Earl of Lauderdale, who was struck with lightning while out on his moor on the 12th, died the same night. It seems that he had with him two keepers, and was hastening home on account of the storm. The men said that at about a quarter past one there was an extremely vivid flash, which, for the moment, blinded them; and, on recovering themselves, they found Lord Lauderdale stretched on the heath insensible. The lightning had apparently struck his head, and, passing downwards, had fused one or two of the links of his gold watch chain. Part of the case was also melted, though, strangely enough, the watch continued to go. The pony was killed. The deer-

130

stalking but which his kindness was
travelling was then to strike and was
thrown by the shock in one direction
while his kindness and the power fell in
another. His eyes were, too, were
watched, though probably by the singer
and not by the other. His death occurred
as he was passing through the door, where he
had been in the habit of going, and he
was seen to enter the door. The
door was closed and he was seen to
enter the room. The door was closed
and he was seen to enter the room.

ARY.
 lery of Dangan Castle, and Baron Mornington of Mornington, co. Meath, in the Peerage of Ireland; Prince of the Poerage in the Netherlands, Duke of Ciudad Rodrigo, and a Grandee of Spain of the First Class, Duke of Veragua, Marquis of Torres Vedras, Count Vimiera, in Portugal, was one of the two sons of the first Duke of Mornington, by his wife Catherine, daughter of the Earl of Mansfield. At the time of his birth his father was Lord

[illegible]

the close, however, he gave his steady allegiance to the Conservative party. He was a faithful follower of Lord Beaconsfield, and it was in his riding school in Knightsbridge that the party gave the celebrated banquet to Lords Beaconsfield and Salisbury on their return from the Berlin Congress in 1878—the banquet at which the Tory chief made the bitterest and the most direct of all his attacks upon Mr. Gladstone.

The Duke married, in 1839, Lady Elizabeth Hay, fourth daughter of George, eighth Marquess of Tweeddale. The Duchess was a Lady of the Bedchamber from 1843 to 1858, and was Mistress of the Robes from 1861 to December 1868, and from February 1874 to May 1880, the latter term coinciding with that of the Disraeli Administration. He died suddenly from heart disease at the Railway Station, Brighton, August 13, and, leaving no issue, was succeeded in the title and estates by his nephew, Henry, elder son of Lord Charles Wellesley.

Colonel Louis de Lusignan, who died at St. Petersburg on August 19, rejoined in the splendid but imaginary titles of "King of Cyprus, King of Armenia, and King of Jerusalem;" and if fortune had been more kind he might have wielded the sceptre of his forefathers, for Louis de Lusignan was descended in a direct line from the highest nobility of the Crusades, and his headship of the family was recognised by the Lusignans of France. His grandfather settled in Russia at the time of the French Revolution, and the late colonel was a Russian subject and a soldier of the Czar; yet he carefully preserved the records of his race and the proofs of his royal descent, never abandoning the hope that the kingdoms of Cyprus and Armenia would sooner or later be revived and himself made their king. At every crisis of the Ottoman Empire—in 1829, in 1832, in 1840, in 1852, and again in 1879—he advanced his claims and demanded the restitution of his realm. In 1879 this poor prince, *in partibus infidelium*, protested against the usurpation of his kingdom of Cyprus by Lord Beaconsfield; he addressed a big memoir on the same subject to the Congress of Berlin, and a little later he demanded from Turkey the modest sum of twenty millions sterling for the surrender of his rights over Palestine and Armenia. He was buried in the cemetery of Smolensko, in a coffin ornamented with a triple royal escutcheon; and his son Michel became chief of the House of Lusignan in his stead.

Lord Amphyll.—Lord Amphyll, British Ambassador at Berlin, who died at his summer villa at Potsdam, August 25, known through the greater part of his career as Mr. Odo William Russell, was the son of Major-General Lord George William Russell, Minister at Berlin, from 1835 to 1841, under the reigns of Frederick William III. and Frederick William IV., father and brother of the present German Emperor. He was born at Florence in 1829, and, like most members of his family during the first half of this century, he was entered at Westminster School as a day boarder. But his appearances at the school were few, for he was brought up "at home and abroad" as he used to say. His father's diplomatic employment obliged the family to lead a wandering life, and Odo Russell owed the best part of his education to the active superintendence of his mother. The effect of this training was that he never imbibed a taste for those open-air sports which English boys love, but, on the other hand, he acquired a far greater liking for modern languages, history, and poetry than is usual among public school lads. If he could not write Latin doggerel, he could read Dante in the original, and he became, before he was out of his teens, a fluent speaker of French, Italian, and German. During his life he was regarded as one of the best linguists in Europe, and certainly as a German scholar he was unsurpassed. It was natural that with his special education and family antecedents he should enter the diplomatic service, and in 1849 he got his first commission as attaché at Vienna, under Sir Arthur Magenis. In the following year, however, he was recalled to England, and served for nearly two years in the Foreign Office, first under Lord Palmerston, and then under the present Lord Granville. In 1853 the young attaché took a spell of work in Paris under Lord Cowley; then went to Vienna, where the genial and lordly Earl of Westmoreland held the Embassy; and, after another short stage in Paris, he was appointed to Constantinople. During Lord Stratford de Redcliffe's two visits to the Crimea in 1855 Mr. Russell was charged with the affairs of the Embassy; and in 1857 Mr. Russell accompanied Lord Napier of Ettrick to the United States, and he remained for a short time paid attaché at Washington. But in 1858 he was transferred to Florence, with instructions to reside at Rome as Secretary of Legation; and it was then that a fine field was first

opened up to his talents. He was informally British Envoy at the Vatican, and in this post had to do delicate work with undivided responsibility. He remained in the Papal city for twelve years, nominally as Secretary of Legation at Naples for a time, after he had been promoted from Florence, but subsequently as Agent on Special Service. These twelve years were the most critical for Italy and the Papacy, being those when the Italian unity was formed, and when the temporal power passed out of the hands of the Pope. In 1870 Mr. Odo Russell was appointed Assistant-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and soon afterwards he was despatched on a special mission to Versailles, where the German armies held their headquarters. The object of his mission was to remonstrate with Count Bismarck on the tearing up of the Black Sea Treaty by Russia, and the language which he used on this occasion was so spirited that it had to be smoothed away a little by Mr. Gladstone in the next session of Parliament. Meanwhile, Mr. Russell had so ingratiated himself with Count Bismarck and the German Court at Versailles, that in October 1871 he was chosen to succeed Lord Augustus Loftus as Ambassador at Berlin. During the fourteen years he remained at this post he enjoyed the friendship of Prince Bismarck, and his personal qualities were precisely those which were required in an ambassador at the Court of Prussia. Perhaps the culminating point of his career was when he sat at the side of Lords Beaconsfield and Salisbury in the Congress of Powers which adjusted the results of the Russo-Turkish war. At this Lord

Odo Russell had to do most of the hard work, which Lord Beaconsfield left to him with the grand, good-humoured remark, "I am a statesman, not a diplomatist." In fact, Lord Beaconsfield could speak no French, or next to none, while the Ambassador could use this language with the fluent elegance of a Parisian, and thus each of the two diplomatists was in a sense the complement of the other. At the subsequent Conference of the Powers, convened at Berlin to settle the frontier disputes between Greece and Turkey, Lord Ampthill, being the sole representative of England (apart from the technical experts), played a more independent part, and to the social gatherings of the members every evening at the British Embassy was due, in great part, the attainment of that common understanding of the difficulty in question which ultimately resulted in its successful solution. A peerage was offered to the Ambassador in reward for his services, but he declined it. Without being a zealous party man, he was loyal to the etiquette and traditions of party service, and he preferred to accept his coronet from a Liberal Ministry. It was given him in 1881, and he took his title from the Manor of Ampthill, in Bedford—a historic spot associated with the memory of Katherine of Aragon. Mr. Russell had already received patent of precedence in 1874, as a Duke's son, when his brother, the present Duke of Bedford, succeeded to the family honours. Lord Ampthill married in 1868 Lady Emily Therese Villiers, third daughter of George, fourth Earl of Clarendon, by whom he left a family of four sons and one daughter.

During the month the following deaths also took place:—On August 1, at Vienna, aged 78, **Heinrich Laube**, the author of several dramatic works, and some time manager of the theatre at Leipsic and of the Stadt Theatre at Vienna. He was a prominent member of the group of literary men at Leipsic called "*Das junge Deutschland*." On August 2, at Geneva, aged 71, **Claude Marie Henry Darneth**, who had long held the chair of political economy in the university there. A Frenchman by birth, and educated in Paris, he joined the Phalanstériens, and advocated their views in the journals. He was in 1848 one of the most renowned orators of the Paris clubs. On August 2, at Massachusetts, aged 76, **Professor J. B. Jenks**, an extensive writer on educational, Oriental, and general topics. He was a remarkable linguist, having acquired a practical knowledge of thirty languages. On August 5, at an hotel in Canterbury, aged 63, **George F. Pardon**, a well-known London writer on billiards and other games, and journalist, under the *nom de plume* of Captain Crawley. On August 8, at his Château of Talmay, **Baron Thénard**, the son of an illustrious chemist, and himself an equally distinguished one. He was an extensive landowner, and was distinguished for his investigations in agricultural chemistry and in improved methods of husbandry. On August 11, at Maida Hill, aged 70, **Bishop Piers Calverley Claughton**, Archdeacon of London, and Chaplain-General of the Forces. After a distinguished University career at Oxford, he was chosen first Bishop of St. Helena, and was subsequently translated

to the See of Colombo, Ceylon. On his retirement he became assistant to the Bishop of London. On August 12, at Windsor, aged 29, **Viscountess Stopford**, the wife of the eldest son of the Earl of Antrim, and the daughter of the fourth Lord Braybrooke. On August 17, at Hove, Brighton, aged 67, **James Fitzherbert Baron de Teissier**, a lieutenant-colonel in Her Majesty's Army (17th Foot), who was present at the siege of Ghuznee and Khybar. On his retirement he took an active part in local affairs, and was connected with several public bodies in the town of Brighton. His father, James de Teissier, received the title of baron in 1819 from Louis XVIII., in consideration of the kindness shown by his father (Lewis de Teissier, of Woodcote Park, Surrey) to French subjects during the Revolution, and in recognition of the loyalty of the Languedoc branch of the family, of whom the chief was guillotined in 1793. On August 22, in Tilney Street, Mayfair, aged 80, **Georgiana Elizabeth Lady Wharnccliffe**, the widow of the third Lord Wharnccliffe, and daughter of the second Earl of Harrowby, K.G. On August 22, at Twickenham, aged 88, **Henry George Bohn, F.S.A.**, bookseller, of York Street, Covent Garden. Of German parentage, he was early engaged in the book trade, as traveller to his father, whose business he developed to a large extent. His collection of classical works, English and translated, was probably the first attempt to popularise literature, but his influence upon public knowledge scarcely met with due recognition. He was an author and editor as well as a publisher, and after retirement from active business, he devoted himself to the collection of works of art, the greater part of which were dispersed before his death (1877-8), and realised large prices. On August 22, at Baden-Baden, aged 80, **Countess Alexandrina von Urach**, the daughter of the Grand Duke Henry of Wurtemberg, by hismorganatic marriage with Christine Alopi, a Berlin actress. She married in early life an officer in the Wurtemberg army, which marriage was dissolved. On August 25, aged 71, **Marmion Edward Ferrers**, of Baddesley Clinton, Warwickshire, the head of the ancient Roman Catholic family of that name, and senior co-heir to the barony of Ferrers of Chartley. On August 25, at St. Germain, **Joseph de Nittis**, a Neapolitan painter, who commenced life as a "facchino," but adopting painting as a profession, he came to Paris, and rapidly rose to distinction, and especially distinguished himself as a painter of street scenes and from life. On August 27, aged 67, **Juan Ignacio Moreno**, Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, and Primate of Spain. He was born in Guatemala, and was for some years a missionary in South America. When Bishop of Valladolid he was confessor to Queen Isabella. On August 29, at Rhives Park Hill, Ross-shire, aged 76, **George Ross**, of Pitcalnie, Ross-shire, "Chief of the Rosses," the representative of the dormant title of Earl of Ross. On August 30, at St. Lawrence-on-Sea, aged 65, **Dr. James Collis Browne**, the inventor of chlorodyne, who was also known in the yachting world for his experiments in the construction of yachts. On August 31, at Falmouth, aged 70, **Sir Robert Michael Torrens, K.C.M.G.**, of Hannaford, Ashburton, Devon, M.P. for Cambridge 1868-1874. He was the son of the late Colonel Robert Torrens, and having been educated at Trinity College, Dublin, he went early in life to Australia (Adelaide), where he was appointed collector of Customs in 1851. In the following year he became Treasurer and subsequently Chief Secretary and Registrar-General of the Colony of South Australia. In 1872 he was made K.C.M.G. for his services, more especially in connection with the Redistribution of Titles to Land Act, a system of simplification of land transfers known as the Torrens Act, which was adopted in all the Australian Colonies and elsewhere.

SEPTEMBER.

Joseph Livesey.—Mr. Joseph Livesey who died at his residence, Bank Parade, Preston, on September 2, in the ninety-first year of his age, enjoyed the reputation of being the founder of the Total Abstinence movement which has now attained to such immense import-

ance in Great Britain and America. When in the early part of the present century the attention of philanthropists began to be directed more especially to the evils of intemperance, an impression generally prevailed that fermented liquors were of considerable food value,

mechanism, and throughout his life produced inventions of every kind, including the weapon known as "Colt's revolver." On September 5, aged 79, **William Henry Hornby**, of Poole Hall, Nantwich, Cheshire, formerly M.P. for Blackburn (1865-1874), and its first mayor on the incorporation of the borough. On September 5, at Moreton-Pinkney, Northamptonshire, aged 94, **Maria Janet Sempill**, Baroness Sempill, in the Peerage of Scotland, last surviving child of fourteenth Lord Sempill. She succeeded her brother, the fifteenth Lord, in 1835, and married Mr. Edward Candler, of Moreton-Pinkney, who, with the Baroness, assumed by royal licence the name of Sempill only. On September 8, aged 83, **George Bentham**, F.R.S., F.L.S., the venerable botanist whose work "Genera Plantarum" was written in company with Sir J. Hooker. On September 10, aged 72, **Rev Charles Walter Bagot**, rector of Castle Rising and Roydon, chancellor of the diocese of Bath and Wells, and registrar of that of Oxford, son of the late Hon. and Right Rev. Richard Bagot, D.D., bishop successively of Oxford and of Bath and Wells. On September 8, at Boisfort, near Brussels, **Baron von Reichenfels**, better known as Prince Henry XX. of Reuss, which title and position he resigned in 1880, on his marriage with a Paris equestrienne. On September 14, at Rome, **Captain Patrick O'Brien**, sometimes acting as vice-consul, sometimes as an extra Queen's messenger, and for some time also as an unaccredited agent to the Vatican. On September 15, on the Big Horn Mountains, from a fall, aged 33, the **Hon. Gilbert Henry Chandos Leigh**, the eldest son of Lord Leigh, M.P. for South Warwickshire. On September 16, aged 66, **Madame Appoline Venevitinoff**, daughter of Count Michael Vielhorski, and granddaughter of the last descendant of the historical family of Matushskine. She was brought up with the Imperial family, and was well known in the intellectual society of St. Petersburg. On September 19, near Birmingham, aged 67, **James Motterham**, Q.C., Judge of the Birmingham District County Courts. He was called to the Bar (1845), and practised for some time as a special pleader. He was a magistrate for the counties of Stafford and Warwick, a member of the Standing Committee for framing the rules of the County Courts, and the joint author with Mr. Chamberlain of the Bankruptcy Act (1883). On September 24, at Sutton Rectory, Surrey, **Rev. John Allen Giles**, D.C.L., successively head master of Camberwell Collegiate School and of the City of London School, and the author of books on educational and other subjects. On September 27, at Langford, East Somerset, aged 70, **Rev. Thomas Freak Simmons**, rector of Dalton Holme, near Hull, and canon of Ripon. Before entering the Church he had been for some time in an Hussar regiment. He acquired a thorough knowledge of military law, on which he was the author of several books and pamphlets. On September 28, at Brussels, aged 73, **Sir Richard George Augustus Lovings**, seventh baronet, of Knockdrin Castle, Mullingar, co. Westmeath, formerly M.P. for that county. On September 28, at Kensington, aged 49, **Sir James Lumsden Seton**, of Pitmeddin, Aberdeenshire, eighth baronet. As captain in the 102nd Foot he served through the Indian and Abyssinian campaigns. On September 29, at St. Petersburg, **Admiral Stephen Voivodsky**, who was one of the few survivors of those present at the battle of Navarino, where he was a midshipman on board a Russian man-of-war. He was for many years commander of the port of Astrachan, and latterly he occupied a seat in the Council of the Admiralty.

OCTOBER.

Duke of Brunswick.—William, Duke of Brunswick, whose death took place October 18, at his château of Sibyllenort, near Breslau, was born in 1806. He was older than all European sovereigns except the German Emperor, and he was the senior by date of accession, for, though Pedro II., Emperor of Brazil, nominally succeeded to his throne eighteen days before William of Brunswick did to his, yet Don Pedro's minority did not cease till 1840, whereas the Duke of Brunswick was of age at the time of his accession, April 25, 1831; and, as a

matter of fact, he actually succeeded to his brother's throne eight months before he was officially proclaimed—that is in September 1830. He was the second son of Duke Frederick William, who fell at Quatre Bras, and the grandson of Charles William, who commanded a wing of the Prussian army at the battle of Jena, and was mortally wounded in defending Auerstadt against Marshal Davoust. His mother, Marie Elizabeth of Baden, fled to Sweden with her two sons after the battle of Jena, which made her husband nominally Duke of

Brunswick: but in 1808 she died, and, while Frederick William, driven from his dominions, was warring against the French at the head of his famous Black Hussars, the boys were taken to England to be educated by their grandmother, George III.'s sister, the Princess Augusta. Frederick William recovered his duchy in 1813, and by the will which he made shortly before his death in the Waterloo campaign, he appointed the Prince Regent of Great Britain guardian of his sons. The disposition of Charles, the elder, was so frivolous that the Prince Regent, by the advice of the Duke of Wellington, delayed putting the Government of Brunswick into his hands till more than a year after he had attained the age of a prince's majority. However, in 1823 Charles became reigning Duke, and in the same year his brother William, who was of much steadier character, entered the Prussian service as major. William had inherited from his father, as a private property, the little principality of Oels in Silesia, and he was reigning there when, in 1830, the extravagant misconduct of his brother Charles drove the Brunswickers to rebellion. Charles fled from the duchy, and William was appointed to rule in his stead—at first as Regent, but in 1831, after Charles's formal deposition by the German Diet, as sovereign Duke. Duke William, in the course of his reign of more than half a century, made himself popular in Brunswick. His only serious difference with his subjects occurred in 1848, when liberal reforms were loudly demanded. At the instigation of Ernest, King of Hanover, William began by resisting the popular movement, but finding it too powerful, he granted a free constitution to his subjects, and it stands greatly to his credit that afterwards, when a reaction set in all over Germany, and sovereigns everywhere tore up the charters that had been wrung from them by the fear of revolution, he almost alone among German Princes made no effort to take back what he had yielded. He had his reward, for the Brunswickers, becoming a free people, gave him a whole-hearted loyalty—indeed, for many years the only grievance they urged against him was that he did not marry. On this point, however, the Duke had less liberty than the lowest of his subjects. It is an open secret that he wished to marry, and on at least two occasions formed projects for a suitable alliance; but he was always thwarted by political intriguers, who were bent on keeping him unmarried in order that Brunswick

might at his death be incorporated in the kingdom of Hanover. By the time Hanover lost its independence the Duke was sixty years old and had given up all ideas of founding a family; but there remained in his mind some bitterness as to the way in which he had been treated about his marriage, and he avoided all familiar intercourse with some half-dozen German Courts which he considered had been in league to affront him. For a similar reason, although he spent part of his infancy and boyhood in England, he would never return to it in his mature age, and to those acquainted with his secret history it was well known that he never wholly recovered from his disappointment at not being honoured with that place close to the English throne which was reserved for a scion of the Saxe-Coburg line. He was very rich, and during nine months of every year led the life of a private gentleman in great comfort. Besides his estates in Silesia, where he spent the shooting season, he had a charming villa on the Lake of Como, a palace at Venice, and another at Vienna. London he seldom visited, Paris never; but he liked Vienna and the Austrian Court, and it was understood that he left all his property to the Emperor Francis Joseph. He was a liberal patron of art, and his collections of pictures, statuary, medals, and engravings were said to be marvellously fine. In his own duchy the Duke did much good. Brunswick became a very handsome city under his auspices. The new palace which he built for himself there is worthy of a first-class capital, and the ducal theatre, erected about the year 1879, and munificently endowed by William I., is a place of which the Brunswickers have reason to be proud. Franz Abt, the composer, was for many years conductor of the orchestra at this theatre, and at one time it boasted the best quartet of violinists in Germany. It has long been famous for its excellent troupes and perfect *mise-en-scène*. The Duke, again, bestowed a generous patronage on his university, and he took great pains to enrich the public library of the little town of Wolfenbüttel (formerly the capital of the duchy), of which Lessing was once librarian. Though Wolfenbüttel had but 11,000 inhabitants, its library, at the time of the death of the Duke, contained more than 120,000 volumes and 10,000 manuscripts.

The Duke of Brunswick was a Knight of the Garter, a field-marshal in the Austrian army, and a general,

with colonelcy of a cavalry regiment, in the Prussian service. But he cared little for military matters, and still less for politics. In the Austro-Prussian campaign of 1866 his sympathies were on the Austrian side, but this was on private grounds; and as it was well known at Berlin that he did not agree with his subjects in their affection for the Hanoverian Court, he escaped sharing the fate which overtook George V. After the Franco-German war, however, an estrangement occurred between William I. and the German Government, for the Duke of Brunswick objected to being deprived of the command of his own army. The Duke never went to Berlin, any more than the King of Bavaria: and when in 1882 the Imperial manoeuvres were held near Breslau the owner of Oels was not there to do the honours of the neighbourhood. He had left his château shortly before the manoeuvres began, and he returned to it soon after their close. With all his curious ways and his frequent absence, on careless pleasure bent, at Oels and Vienna, he enjoyed the love and devotion of his subjects more than many stay-at-home sovereigns, and his people got from him all they wanted in the field of constitutional, municipal, and legal reform.

Alexander Martin Sullivan, M.P.—Mr. A. M. Sullivan, who died at Dartrey, Rathgar, October 17, was one of the ablest and most popular members of the Irish National party, and he occupied for many years an active and distinguished place in public life. Of humble parentage, a native of Castle-town Berehaven, co. Cork, where he was born in the year 1820, he was endowed with natural gifts of a high order, which needed but the limited culture of the National system of education to develop and mature. He was of an ardent, generous temperament, and while the education which he received gave him a keen intelligence, his daily experience of peasant life, its habits of thought, and its social vicissitudes, made him feel a deeper, warmer sympathy with the class to which he belonged. After filling for a time a subordinate office under the Poor Law Board, he came to Dublin and was employed in etching and wood-engraving for illustrated publications. Meanwhile he found a congenial field for his literary ability in the profession of journalism, to which he devoted himself with characteristic zeal. He became a contributor to the *Nation* newspaper, and after the

troubles of 1848, when Sir Charles Gavan Duffy was obliged to sever his connection with it, he became proprietor and editor, a position which he filled with marked success, maintaining worthily the high reputation which the paper had achieved under its former régime. He was a fearless but a fair and honourable opponent, who smote with all his might, but in open, manly combat, and with weapons not unworthy of brave men. Few men connected with the popular movement have received so large a share of public homage from all parties by his brilliant talents and his eminent virtues. His impassioned eloquence won the cordial admiration of his most uncompromising political opponents as much as of his warmest friends and colleagues, while his generous and honourable spirit and his genial, sympathetic manner made him an object of esteem in every circle in which he moved. He was always an advanced and earnest Nationalist—one of the few whose sincerity was not doubted—and when the Home Rule movement was started he threw himself into it with all the ardour of his nature. He was one of the ablest and most determined advocates of temperance, and rendered good service to those who promoted Sunday-closing and other objects connected with the cause. His connection with the *Nation* continued from 1855 to the end of 1876, when, having joined the Bar, he removed to London and devoted himself to his new profession and to literary pursuits. His part in political life, although chiefly, was not exclusively that of a journalist. In the effort to secure his return in 1867, during the Fenian insurrectionary movement, he was an object of suspicion because his sympathy did not carry him so far as the advanced party at that time; but he remained true to his own convictions, and wrote as strongly as he could on the Nationalist side,—so strongly, indeed, that he was twice prosecuted for seditious articles and was imprisoned for some months. He was a member of the Corporation of Dublin at the time, and it was proposed, in recognition of his devotion to the cause, to elect him to the office of Lord Mayor, and to present him with a public testimonial, but he declined to accept the intended tribute. In the general election of 1874 he was returned to Parliament as member for county Louth, displacing Mr. Chichester Fortescue, who had held the seat for years; and in 1880 he was elected for county Meath. He retired, however, in 1882,

finding that his pursuits in London did not allow of his devoting sufficient time to the efficient discharge of his Parliamentary duties.

Professor Hillebrand.—Karl Hillebrand, a distinguished German, French, and English writer, who died at Florence, October 20, in his fifty-fifth year, was born at Giessen, and had to leave his country in consequence of the political disturbances in Baden in 1849. He first settled in France as Professor of Belles-Lettres in Douai, then at Bordeaux, and finally in Paris, where he became a regular worker in the *Journal des Débats*, *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, &c. Later in life he resided permanently in Florence. He made himself known in this country by his lectures on "England and the English," extracts from which were published as articles in the *Nineteenth Century*. His health gave way a few years before his death, grievously attacking his bright faculties and to some extent paralysing his intellectual activity. In German, Hillebrand published "Frankreich und die Franzosen," "Geschichte Frankreichs seit 1830," &c. In French, "Di no Compagni," "De la Bonne Comédie," &c. He also edited for several years, in a quarterly volume entitled "Italia," a series

of miscellaneous essays in German on Italian political, social, and literary subjects, original and translated. Part of his German and French writings have seen the light in English translations. Hillebrand was a strikingly handsome type of a highly civilised German, and his warmth and kindness of heart and gentlemanly address combined with his personal advantages and intellectual gifts to endear him to a large circle of friends and acquaintances in most European countries. Though deeply wounded by the ill-treatment he himself and his countrymen received at the hand of French fanatics after the Franco-Prussian war, he evinced throughout his life a sincere attachment to the country which first afforded him hospitality, and in his writings did full justice to the mental and moral qualities which distinguish the great neighbour and rival of his German fatherland. From his twentieth year, though Hillebrand frequently repaired for health to the mountains and lakes of Bavaria, he only temporarily revisited Germany, and never actually resided in any part of it. He was an ardent lover and a thorough connoisseur of all the fine arts, equally at home in artistic as in literary subjects.

During the month the following deaths also took place:—On October 2, at Kappel, in Switzerland, aged 89, **Professor Karl Voelker**. He fought at the battle of Leipsic, and being proscribed as the intimate friend of Sand, after the murder of Kotzebué, he came to England, where he established a school for the German system of gymnastics, and was also one of the earliest advocates of the Pestalozzian system in this country.—On October 3, at Vienna, aged 44, **Herr Makart**, a celebrated Hungarian painter.—On October 3, at Dresden, aged 75, **General Bernard von Schimpff**, who commanded Saxony's contingent to the Federal force, which in 1863 took possession of the Duchy of Holstein. He subsequently commanded a division in the re-organised army that followed the peace, but retired in 1869.—On October 4, at Lausanne, **Augustus Craven**, the husband of the well-known authoress. In early life he was in the army, but he subsequently entered the diplomatic service as private secretary to Lord Palmerston, and was at different periods of his life attached to the Legations in Paris and Brussels. He recently, at the request of the Queen, made an abridged translation into French of the life of the Prince Consort.—On October 6, aged 77, **Alexis Jean Achard**, one of the most widely-known of French landscape-painters.—On October 6, at Cromwell House, South Kensington, aged 60, **Sir Charles James Frenke**, of Fulwell Park, Middlesex, and of Bark Grove, Surrey. He amassed a large fortune in building transactions in South Kensington. A baronetcy was conferred upon him in 1882 in recognition of his interest in the Royal College of Music.—On October 9, at Corfu, aged 77, **Sir Charles Sobright, K.C.M.G.**, for many years H.B.M.'s Consul-General for the Ionian Islands. Before entering the British service, he was for some time attorney and secretary to Charles Louis, Duke of Lucca, and ex-Duke of Parma, by whom he was created Baron d'Everton in the Duchy of Lucca.—On October 13, at Halecote, Grange-over-Sands, Lancashire, aged 76, **Colonel the Hon. Charles James Fox Smith Stanley**, son of the thirteenth Earl of Derby, K.G., a magistrate for Lancashire, and for the North Riding of Yorkshire, and formerly a lieutenant-colonel in the Grenadier Guards.—On October 16, aged 76, **Paul Lacroix**, who was well known under the name of the Bibliophile Jacob. He was for many years keeper of the Arsenal Library, and the author of a large number of historical works.

On October 17, at Dublin, aged 63, **Rev. Richard Townsend**, Senior Fellow of the University of Dublin. He was an eminent mathematician, and the author of some valuable scientific essays.—On October 18, in Walpole Street, S.W., aged 70, **Major Charles Czulewski**, President of the Polish Historical Society. An officer of Artillery in the Polish army during the insurrection of 1830-31, he came to London after the capture of Warsaw, and was appointed secretary to the Literary Association of Friends of Poland, and received a civil appointment in the War Department, Pall Mall.—On October 21, at Fontainebleau Palace, where he was librarian, aged 80, **Adolphe Regnier**, the eminent philologist. He was formerly tutor to the Comte de Paris, and accompanied him and his mother to the memorable sitting of the Chamber during the Revolution of 1848. He was well known for his grammatical works on German, Greek, and Sanscrit; and he edited a collection of the great French writers.—On October 25, at Redhill, Surrey, aged 74, **Sir Valentine Fleming**, son of the late Captain Valentine Fleming, of Tuam, co. Galway. Educated at Trinity College, Dublin, he was called to the Bar in 1838, and was appointed commissioner of the Insolvent Debtors' Court in Hobart Town 1841, solicitor-general for Tasmania 1844, attorney-general 1848, afterwards various offices until he became chief justice of the Supreme Court, Tasmania, 1854. He was knighted in 1856, and retired in 1870.—On October 25, aged 76, **Rev. Alexander Anderson, M.A., LL.D.**, the founder and head of the Chantry School (the Gymnasium) old Aberdeen.

NOVEMBER.

Marquess of Londonderry.—George Henry Robert Charles William Vane-Tempest, Marquess and Earl of Londonderry, Viscount Castlereagh, county Down, in the peerage of Ireland; and also Earl Vane, Viscount Seaham, of Wynyard and Seaham, county Durham, and Baron Stewart, of Stewart's Court and Ballylawn, county Donegal, in the peerage of the United Kingdom, K.P., was the second and eldest surviving son of Charles William, third Marquess; a general in the British army, who gained distinction both as a soldier and a diplomatist. He was born at Vienna, April 26, 1821; educated at Eton, and at Balliol College, Oxford, where he took his Bachelor's degree in 1844, and proceeded M.A. in 1867. He was returned to Parliament in the Conservative interest in 1847 as one of the members for North Durham, and sat in the House of Commons until March 1854, when on the death of his father he inherited the earldom of Vane, and removed to the House of Lords. By his brother's death in 1872 he succeeded to all the honours formerly enjoyed by his father, and to the vast estates of both the Londonderry and Vane-Tempest families. Lord Londonderry was Lord-Lieutenant of the county of Durham, a magistrate and Deputy-Lieutenant for the counties of Merioneth and Montgomery, and also a magistrate for Flintshire and for the North Riding of Yorkshire, and chairman of Quarter Sessions for the county of Merioneth. In 1867 he went on a special mission to St. Petersburg to invest the Emperor

Alexander II. with the Order of the Garter, when he received the Grand Cross of St. Alexander Newski. Lord Londonderry married in August 1846 **Mary Cornelia**, only child and heiress of Sir John Edwards, M.P., of Greenfields, Montgomeryshire, by whom he had issue three sons and three daughters. He died at his residence, Plas Machynlleth, Montgomeryshire, November 5.

The Right Hon. Henry Fawcett, M.P.—The Right Hon. Henry Fawcett, Postmaster-General, whose death took place at Cambridge, November 6, was the son of Mr. W. Fawcett, J.P., of Salisbury, and was born August 26, 1833. Educated first at a local school near Salisbury, he was sent at the age of fourteen to Queenwood College, Hampshire, and after a stay there of three years to King's College, London. In 1852 he went to Trinity Hall, Cambridge, graduating in 1856 with high mathematical honours, being seventh wrangler, and in the same year he was elected a Fellow of his hall. After leaving college Mr. Fawcett began to study for the Bar, devoting at the same time much attention to the science of political economy, especially its later developments as displayed in the writings of John Stuart Mill. On September 17, 1858, while out partridge shooting with his father, he was accidentally shot in the face and entirely deprived of sight, both eyes being pierced in the centre. Until the worst was known, he suffered greatly from

anxiety, but when he found his case was hopeless he quickly recovered his mental serenity, and determined that his loss should make as little difference as was possible with his habits and plans of life. To this determination he ever afterwards adhered, and the manner in which he triumphed over his affliction is one of the most admirable features of his career. Returning to Cambridge, he resumed his studies with the aid of a reader, and within a year of the accident he delivered an address at a meeting of the British Association at Aberdeen on the "Economic Effects of the recent Gold Discoveries," which attracted great attention at the time. From this period he appeared frequently in public, speaking upon economic and social subjects, and advocating the interests of the working classes. In 1861 he offered himself as a candidate for the parliamentary representation of the borough of Southwark, but retired from the contest before the election. In 1863 he contested the borough of Cambridge, but lost by a majority of 80. The same year appeared his "Manual of Political Economy," a work which followed, though with an independent judgment, the teaching of John Stuart Mill; and he was also at this time a voluminous contributor of articles on economic and political science to the leading reviews and magazines. In 1863 also he was elected Professor of Political Economy in Cambridge University, and about the same period made a third unsuccessful attempt to get into the House of Commons, contesting the representation of Brighton. In 1865 he was returned for Brighton by a large majority, and delivered his maiden speech in connection with the Whig Reform Bill of 1866. In 1867 he supported the Bill for the abolition of religious tests required from members of the University of Oxford, and in 1869 he drew the attention of the House to the restrictions on the scholarships and fellowships of Trinity College. He soon became recognised in the House of Commons as a leader among the Radicals, and his ability and independence gained for him considerable influence in debate. Among the subjects which specially engaged his attention, that of the Government of India held the foremost place; and his acknowledged mastery over the mysteries of Indian finance and his defence of the interests of the native population gained for him great popularity in India. He had been re-elected

for Brighton in 1868, but at the general election of 1874 he was rejected in favour of a Conservative. The retirement of Sir Charles Reed, however, left a vacancy for Hackney, and he was elected a member for this borough, which he continued to represent until his death. It is a noteworthy fact that when he first appeared before the electors of this borough some native Indian gentlemen came to assist in his canvass, and at the public meetings which were held strongly urged his claims upon the voters.

When Mr. Gladstone came into power after the general election of 1880 he proffered Mr. Fawcett the office of Postmaster-General, which was accepted. With characteristic ardour, he plunged into the duties appertaining to this office, and before the close of the first session of his official career had introduced several legislative reforms affecting the business of the Post Office. The most important of the reforms he introduced had reference to the reduction of the cost of money orders, and the adoption of a method for giving them wider currency; a plan to encourage small deposits with the Savings Bank; and some valuable improvements in the modes of conducting the business of granting annuities and effecting life insurance. As he publicly announced on several occasions, the elaboration of these schemes was due rather to some of the permanent officials of the Post Office than himself, but it was nevertheless under his energetic and reforming administration that they were brought into practical use and established. The Parcel Post, which he also established, though very useful to the community, had not, up to his death, proved a commercial success. At the time of his death he was busily engaged in perfecting other useful reforms in connection with the postal and telegraph services, and in preparing the way for the cheaper telegrams demanded by the House of Commons.

A new edition of his "Manual of Political Economy" appeared in 1869, with two fresh chapters, entitled respectively "National Education" and "The Poor Laws and their Influence on Pauperism." In 1874 a third edition of the work with additional chapters was published. He was also the author of a work on "Pauperism: its Causes and Remedies," issued in 1871; of "Speeches on some Current Political Questions," published in 1873; and a work on "Free Trade and Protection,"

which appeared in 1878, and of which a fourth edition was issued in 1882.

Throughout his life Mr. Fawcett retained the same love for athletic exercises by which he had been distinguished as an undergraduate at Cambridge. Notwithstanding his loss of sight, he was an excellent angler, a hard rider, and an adept in rowing and skating. In the latter exercise he was especially proficient, and frequently went for a spin, in the company of his friends, for 30 or 40 miles on the ice in the Cambridgeshire and Lincolnshire fens. As a speaker he was distinguished for a close, compact, and argumentative style, with no pretensions to eloquence of the emotional and imaginative type; there were few speakers in the House of Commons who could so marshal the facts and statistics of their addresses that the whole should be clearly and readily understood. He was always clear and perspicuous, simple in illustration, and yet full of matter. In his addresses outside the House to his constituents and elsewhere he indulged occasionally in a little humour, and his words were always followed with close and eager attention on the part of his audiences.

In April 1867 Mr. Fawcett married Millicent, daughter of Mr. Newson Garrett, of Aldeburgh, Suffolk. Mrs. Fawcett is the author of a work entitled "Political Economy for Beginners," of a little volume of "Tales in Political Economy," and was also joint author with her husband of a volume of essays and lectures on political subjects.

Mr. Fawcett was sworn in a member of the Privy Council in May 1880, and the same year the honorary degree of D.C.L. was conferred upon him by the University of Oxford.

General Lawrence. — General Sir George St. Patrick Lawrence, K.C.S.I., C.B., who died at Kensington Park Gardens on November 16, in his 80th year, was the eldest member of a famous brotherhood, the names of which will be handed down to the remotest posterity of Englishmen. With greater favour at the hands of fortune he might have become not less famous than either of his younger brothers; but, nevertheless, he enjoyed in his time a reputation for almost unequalled valour and chivalry. He joined the Bengal Cavalry in 1821, but it was not until the Afghan campaign seventeen years later that he saw any active service, and then he joined the army of

the Indus. In Afghanistan he was present at the capture of Ghazni, and he also took part under Outram in the active but futile chase of Dost Mahomed through the Bamian Pass. He was present later on in the still more memorable cavalry encounter at Purwandurrah, when Dost Mahomed succeeded in inflicting a momentary reverse upon our army, although he surrendered the next day. When dissension increased among the Afghans, and Sir Alexander Barnes took up his residence in Cabul, George Lawrence proposed to occupy the city in force and to seize the persons of the chiefs who were known to be most inimical to our cause. He was himself attacked on the very day of Sir Alexander Barnes' murder, and may be said to have owed his escape to the fleetness of his steed. His evidence of the events which followed has always been considered the very strongest as showing how the Cabul catastrophe might have been easily averted by a little promptitude and vigour. His Afghan experiences culminated in the treacherous murder of Sir William Macnaghten — an act of which he was an immediate spectator, and which he has fully described in his interesting work "Forty-three Years in India." On that occasion he was seized and made prisoner, and he owed his escape again to the fleetness of his horse and to the intervention of an Afghan chief. During the captivity in Afghanistan, which lasted until the advance of General Pollock and his avenging legions, Lawrence shared with the late Vincent Eyre and Colin Mackenzie the pains of an Afghan dungeon. During the first Sikh war he came to England, and at its close he was appointed to the responsible post of Political Agent at Peshawur; and when the second war broke out it was his misfortune to be a prisoner for a second time in the hands of the Afghans until the liberation of prisoners which was effected after the battle of Goojerat. His service in the political department both at Peshawur and later on in Rajpootana was officially deemed on several occasions to be most valuable; so that on the eve of the Mutiny he found himself raised to the responsible office of Agent for Rajpootana. On the outbreak at Meerut and Delhi becoming known in Rajpootana, where local feuds and dissensions added greatly to the embarrassment caused by a rebellion against the foreign rulers of the land, Sir George, or rather as he then was Colonel, Lawrence had to

reckon up his resources, to mark his enemies, and to make the best front he could to the numerous dangers that confronted him. He held a province of ten millions, with a native garrison of 5,000 men, and less than thirty English officers. His first care was to provide for the security of the arsenal at Ajmere, and he succeeded in protecting that place not merely against hostile attack, but also against a treacherous garrison on the point of breaking its faith. By the exhibition of rare skill, courage, and firmness, he was enabled to keep Rajpootana quiet during the most critical months of 1857, and that meant much when disaffection was surely spreading from the north into Central India. It has been said that if "Rajpootana had risen, Agra could not have held out, and our force at Delhi could not have maintained its ground." In the last year of the Mutiny Sir George Lawrence took the field against the Thakore of Awah, and a few months later he also dealt out well-merited chastisement to the ruler of Kotah. His last service was to take part in the pursuit and capture of the arch-rebel Tantia Topsee after the dispersal of his troops round Gwalior. After a short visit to England in 1861 he decided that he had seen enough Eastern service, and retired in 1864, after forty-three years passed in the army of his country, during which he had taken an honourable and prominent part in three of the most memorable Indian campaigns of the last half-century.

Susanna Winkworth.—Susanna Winkworth, who died November 25 at Clifton, Bristol, was the eldest daughter of the late Mr. Henry Winkworth, of Manchester. Her name is well known

in the literary world by her compilation and translation of Niebuhr's *Life and Letters*, the "*Theologia Germanica*," the "*History and Sermons of Dr. John Tauler*," with additional notices of his life and times, the continuation of the "*Life of Luther*" begun by Archdeacon Hare, and Professor Max Müller's beautiful little book entitled "*German Love*." She was in early life the pupil of the late Rev. W. Gaskell and the Rev. Dr. Martineau, and in later life was the friend of the Hares, Maurice, Charles Kingsley, the Rev. Canon Percival, and more especially of Baron Bunsen. Seeing her remarkable power of apprehending and rendering into forcible English the subtle workings of the German theological mind, Bunsen entrusted to her the translation of his "*Signs of the Times*" and his "*God in History*." She was the elder sister of Catherine Winkworth, the author of "*Lyra Germanica*." Devoted from her earliest days to practical work among the poor, and always aiming at methods which should help without pauperising, she was among the first in Bristol to grapple with the problem which has lately occupied so much public attention, the provision of wholesome dwellings for the labouring classes in great cities. For some years she rented houses and let them out in tenements, and afterwards formed the company which built the well-known Jacob's Wells industrial dwellings in a poor part of Bristol. Working on the lines which Miss Octavia Hill has made so familiar to the British public, she continued the management of this property to the time of her death. She was a governor of the Red Maids' School in Bristol, and a member of the council of Cheltenham Ladies' College.

During the month the following deaths also took place:—On November 1, at Benares, aged 96, **Mrs. Kennedy**, the widow of Lieutenant-General James Kennedy, C.B., a lady who never left India, and who was the mother of eighteen children, of whom seven were generals in the Army. On November 1, at Antigua, West Indies, aged 66, **Edwin Donald Baynes, C.M.G.**, late Colonial Secretary, and Lieutenant-Governor of the Leeward Islands, to which office he was appointed in 1876, after useful service in different parts of the West Indies. On November 2, aged 75, **General Ferdinand von Benthelm**, a distinguished officer of the Prussian Army during the Franco-German war, upon the conclusion of which he was appointed Governor of Metz. On November 2, aged 86, **Gustave Reichardt**, a popular song-writer of Germany, to whose music Dr. Arndt's celebrated lyric, "*Was ist des Deutschen Vaterland?*" is universally sung. On November 3, at Southsea, aged 68, **General Charles Lavallin Nugent**, late of 58th Regiment, with which he served with distinction in the New Zealand war of 1845-6. On November 4, aged 75, **Sir George Frederick Harvey, K.C.S.I.**, son of the late Sir John Harvey, K.C.B., entered the Bengal Civil Service, and was Commissioner at Agra during the Mutiny. On November 4, at Notting Hill, aged 81, **Octavian Blewitt**, for forty-six years secretary to the Literary Fund. The son of a merchant, and brought up for the medical profession, he turned his attention to literature, was a

great traveller, and the author of several well-known works, including some handbooks in Murray's series. On November 4, aged 63, **Count Longay**, a distinguished Hungarian statesman, who began life in the Opposition, and was obliged to quit Hungary on the collapse of the revolution of 1848. On the amnesty he returned to his own country, and subsequently held various offices of State, became a member of the Upper Chamber, and was created a Count. He was the author of several works upon finance. On November 5, at St. Petersburg, **Baron Stieglitz**, a well-known Russian millionaire, and chief of the banking firm of that name, which was dissolved in 1860. After his retirement into private life he continued to exercise great influence over the Finance Department of the Russian Government. On November 6, at Dover, aged 96, **General Poole Vallancey England**, Colonel Commandant of the Royal Artillery. He served in the expedition to the Weser in 1805-6, and took part in the Peninsular Campaign of 1813. On November 7, at Berlin, **Admiral Archibald Maclean**, a distinguished officer of the Imperial Navy. He was descended from one of the numerous Scottish families who settled on the shores of the Baltic about the close of the Seven Years' War. On November 8, at Paris, **E. Philippoteaux**, the historical and military painter, and a pupil of Léon Cogniet, chief author of the panorama of the siege of Paris. On November 8, at Berne, aged 80, **His Excellency General von Boeder**, for many years Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the German Empire to the Swiss Confederation. On November 10, at St. Aubin's, Jersey, aged 64, **Sir Robert Phipps Maret**, chief magistrate and bailiff of Jersey, and President of the States Assembly. Admitted to the Bar there at the age of 20, he afterwards filled the offices of Solicitor and Attorney-General of Jersey. On November 10, at Colchester, aged 63, **Lieutenant-General William Freeland Brett**, formerly of the 54th Foot, which regiment he commanded during the burning of the "Sarah Sands" at sea, when the conduct of the troops on board drew forth high eulogy in a general order from the Horse Guards. On November 11, aged 72, **Sir William Wright**, of Sigglesworth Hall, Yorkshire. He was the son of the late Mr. George Wright, a merchant of Liverpool, and was well known as an amateur farmer and breeder of stock. He was for many years Chairman of the Directors of the Hull Dock Company, and was a magistrate and Deputy-Lieutenant for the East Riding of Yorkshire. On November 11, **Prince Asnah**, uncle of the late King of Ashantee. He was educated in England, from which country he received a pension of 100*l.* a year, and with which he always maintained friendly relations. On November 12, aged 70, **Henry Hayward**, of Wolverhampton, an eminent violinist, who played his first solo in public at the age of 5, and for nearly half a century performed at the principal musical festivals in the kingdom. On November 13, at Portlade, Sussex, aged 43, **Sir Joseph Napier**, the son of the late Right Honourable Sir Joseph Napier, LL.D., ex-Lord Chancellor of Ireland, whom he succeeded as second Baronet in 1882. On November 13, at Southsea, aged 66, **Lieutenant-General Robert Richards**, late of the Bombay Staff Corps. He served with the Army of the Punjab in 1848-9, and with the field force sent against the tribes on the Swat border, retiring in 1881. On November 13, aged 54, **Dr. Alfred Brehm**, the celebrated naturalist and traveller. The son of a Thuringian ornithologist, he made scientific tours as far as Africa, Siberia, and Turkistan, and was for some years director of the Zoological Gardens at Hamburg. On November 14, at Balmoral, aged 90, **Willie Blair**, the 'Queen's Highland fiddler,' and an enthusiastic musician. On November 17, at Southsea, aged 82, **Sir James Saumarez Jephson, B.N.** The son of the late Sir Richard Mounteney Jephson, he succeeded his brother as third Baronet in 1870. He was for some time Secretary to the Carlton Club. On November 18, aged 51, **Vassily Vassilievitch Bauer**, professor of modern history at St. Petersburg, one of Russia's most prominent men of learning. On November 19, suddenly, at Rome, aged 47, **Colonel Francis James Napier Mackenzie**, Bengal Staff Corps (retired). He was rescued from the earthquake at Casamicciola in August 1883, and his account of the destruction was published in the *Times* of August 10, 1883. On November 21, in Dublin, aged 82, **Rev. Hon. Mountiford Longfield, D.D.**, the son of the late Rev. Mountiford Longfield, Vicar of Desert Magee, co. Cork. He was called to the Irish Bar, where he enjoyed a high reputation. He was one of the tribunal to which the administration of the Encumbered Estates Act was entrusted, and his experience was consulted in the preparation of the Land Act. After the passing of the Church Act, he filled the office of Assessor in the General Synod with judicial impartiality, was a Commissioner of National Education; also known as a writer and lecturer upon economic questions. On November 21, at Rome, aged 76, **James Edward Free-**

man, the oldest among the American painters resident in Rome, the author of an interesting book on artist life in Rome. On November 22, at Southampton, aged 92, **Lieutenant-Colonel Severus William Lynam Stretton**, formerly of 40th Foot, one of the few remaining veterans of the Peninsular Campaign. After much active service he retired in 1852, and devoted himself to local business. On November 23, at Bradford Abbas, Dorset, aged 70, **James Buckman, F.G.S., F.L.S., F.S.A.**, for fifteen years professor of geology and botany at the Royal Agricultural College, Cirencester, and some time Curator and Resident Professor at the Birmingham Philosophical Institution. On November 25, at Gloucester, aged 86, **Very Rev. Henry Law, M.A.**, Dean of Gloucester, the son of the late Rt. Rev. George Henry Law, Bishop successively of Chester and Bath and Wells. He was some time Rector of Weston-super-Mare, one of the members of the Evangelical School. On November 25, at Shalford House, Guildford, aged 76, **Robert Alfred Cloyne Godwin-Austen, F.R.S., F.G.S., &c.**, a well-known antiquary, son of Sir Henry E. Austen, of Shalford. On November 26, aged 67, **John Bonham-Carter**, of Adhurst St. Mary's, Hants, formerly M.P. for Winchester. He was the son of the late John Bonham-Carter, M.P. for Portsmouth. He was at various periods a Lord of the Treasury, Chairman of Committees of the House of Commons, and Deputy-Speaker. On November 26, at Harrogate, aged 59, **Thomas Collins, M.P.** for Knaresborough, where his family had been settled for upwards of two centuries. On November 27, aged 74, **Fanny Ellsler**, the celebrated dancer. A Viennese by birth, she amassed, with her sister Theresa, a large fortune by her performances in Europe and America. On November 29, at Stanmore Hall, Middlesex, aged 62, **Ellen Julia**, the widow of Robert Holland, a lady who was well known in Paris, where for many years, up to 1870, her *salon* attracted the *élite* of the Liberal party. She was the author of "Vie de Channing," and "Vie de Village en Angleterre," and was the idealised original of Ary Scheffer's "Monica." On November 30, at Edinburgh, aged 58, **Sir Alexander Grant, D.C.L., LL.D.**, Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Edinburgh. He succeeded his father as ninth Baronet in 1856. Born at New York and educated in England, he became a Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, and held various educational appointments in India. On November 30, at Costessy Park, Norwich, aged 82, **Henry Valentine Stafford-Jerningham**, ninth Baron Stafford, the son of George William, the eighth Lord, who obtained the restoration of the ancient barony, dormant since 1678. He was one of the first Roman Catholics who sat in the House of Commons after the passing of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, when he was chosen member for Pontefract. On November 30, aged 68, **Dr. W. Wells Brown**, of Boston, Massachusetts, an eminent negro. The son of a slave mother, he received the elements of his education as an office boy to a newspaper editor. In later life he became well known as an abolitionist, assisting in the flight of slaves, lecturing in their cause both in London and Paris.

DECEMBER.

The Right Hon. Joseph Warner Henley. — The Right Hon. Joseph Warner Henley was the only son of Mr. Joseph Henley, by his wife Anne, daughter of the late Mr. C. Rooke, of Wandsworth, Surrey. He was born in the year 1793, and was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, of which he was a Gentleman Commoner, and where he took his Bachelor's degree in 1815. He proceeded M.A. in 1834, and was created an honorary D.C.L. in 1852. Belonging to a family of hereditary Tory tendencies, Mr. Henley naturally identified himself with the principles of that party. Many years before it was his fortune to secure a seat in Par-

liament he became known in his own locality as an active and consistent supporter of the policy of the Conservatives. He entered Parliament as M.P. for Oxfordshire at the general election of 1841, when he became one of the leading and influential members of Sir Robert Peel's large working majority, and zealously supported his leader until the conversion of the latter to Free Trade views. Mr. Henley did not speak in the great debate on the Corn Laws; but his name figured in the minority when the memorable division of February 28, 1846, showed 337 votes against and only 240 in favour of the continuance of the tax

on corn. Still representing the same constituency, Mr. Henley remained an active member of the House of Commons during the premiership of Lord John Russell, which succeeded the overthrow of Sir Robert Peel in 1846. His name at that time appeared very frequently in the debates, and he appears to have been rarely absent from a division of importance. He was diligent in fulfilling his duties as a Committee-man, and indefatigable in attending to the interests of his constituents. On the accession of Lord Derby for the first time to power in February 1852 Mr. Henley was offered and accepted the post of President of the Board of Trade, in succession to Lord Stanley of Alderley, and was at the same time sworn a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council; but of course he retired with his party on the break-up of that Administration. He resumed the same office on the return of Lord Derby to the Treasury in 1858, but resigned it in the March of the year following in consequence of his dissatisfaction with the Government Reform Bill, and more especially with the clauses relating to the forty-shilling freeholders. He retired in company with the Home Secretary, Mr. Spencer Walpole, and from that period he took no part in official life. Mr. Henley, however, was an active supporter of Lord Beaconsfield, both in office and in opposition, down to a comparatively recent date; and it is almost needless to add that he voted against Mr. Gladstone's Irish Church Disestablishment Bill in 1869.

Mr. Henley was in many ways a representative man in the House of Commons. He was almost the last of the race of country gentlemen pure and simple, shrewd, original, witty, and full of common sense, which, as the acknowledged "Mentor" of the House, he would often exhibit in blunt expressions uttered with a racy and old-fashioned humour which at times savoured of Fielding. Even at Westminster, as in Oxfordshire, he was quite "the old squire;" and all that he said in his place in Parliament was listened to as attentively and respectfully as if he had been talking at the Oxfordshire Quarter Sessions. It was owing to his high personal character and the union of common sense with shrewdness which he always exhibited, rather than to brilliant abilities, or power of oratory, that we must ascribe the consideration which he uniformly met with in St. Stephen's. His great and length-

ened experience as a magistrate, as a landowner, and as a senator combined to enable him to speak on a variety of matters with a certainty and an authority which could not be attained by his colleagues. He was an active magistrate and also a deputy-lieutenant for Oxfordshire, in which county his estate of Waterperry was situated, and was also for some years chairman of the Oxfordshire Quarter Sessions. He married, in 1817, Georgiana, fourth daughter of the late Mr. John Fane, of Wormsley Park, Oxfordshire, by whom he had a family of six daughters and three sons. One of his daughters married the Ven. Archdeacon Denison. He was succeeded in the family estates by his eldest son, Mr. Joseph John Henley, who was born in 1821, and married, in 1851, Agnes Walwyn, daughter of the late Mr. Theodore Walrond, of Calder Park, Lanarkshire.

Marquess of Cholmondeley.—William Henry Hugh Cholmondeley, who died at his seat, Houghton Hall, in Norfolk, December 16, was born August 31, 1800. He was the younger of the two sons of George James, fourth Earl and first Marquess of Cholmondeley, by marriage with the Lady Georgina Charlotte Bertie, second daughter and co-heiress of Peregrine, third Duke of Ancaster. He was educated at Eton, where he was the form-fellow of Lord Howden, some time Minister at Madrid, the late Earl of Carnarvon, Dr. Denison, Bishop of Salisbury, and the late Lord Ossington. From Eton he passed to Christ Church, but, like many of the young noblemen of his time, he seems to have left the University without taking a degree. At the age of twenty-two, as Lord Henry Cholmondeley, he entered the House of Commons as one of the members for the pocket borough of Castle Rising, in the place of his brother, Lord Rocksavage, who was called to the Upper House in his father's barony of Newburgh. He was not a very keen or busy politician, but he supported the Tory Ministries of Lord Liverpool and the Duke of Wellington. In 1832 Castle Rising figured among the boroughs disfranchised in Schedule A of Lord John Russell's Reform Act; and Lord Henry remained out of Parliament until 1852, when he came in again as one of the members for South Hampshire, in which county he owned a property at Holly Hill, near Southampton. At the dissolution of 1857, however, he did not offer himself for re-election. In May 1870, on his elder

brother's death, he succeeded to the marquise and the rest of the family honours, and to the estates of Cholmondeley Castle, in Cheshire, and of Houghton Hall, in Norfolk, the latter formerly the seat of Sir Robert Walpole, whose only daughter brought it to the Cholmondeleys by her marriage with the great-grandfather of the subject of the present record. The splendid gallery of pictures which once adorned the walls of Houghton did not, however, descend to the owner, having found their way to St. Petersburg during the last century, as related by Sir Nathaniel William Wraxall. Lord Cholmondeley contented himself with taking anything but a prominent part in the proceedings of the Upper House, though he supported by his votes all the moderate measures of his party. He deprecated extremes in politics, and was much respected on both sides of the House. He was an excellent and considerate landlord, and did his best to encourage agricultural improvements both in the north and in the east of England. Like his elder brother, he was a generous supporter of most of those religious societies which have, or used to have, their home at Exeter Hall; and his name was frequently to be seen side by side with those of Lord Shaftesbury and Lord Chichester among the lists of patrons of good and charitable works, especially such as were indorsed by the Evangelical party. Besides being Marquess and Earl of Cholmondeley, the deceased nobleman was Earl of Rock-savage in the peerage of the United Kingdom; Viscount Malpas and Baron Cholmondeley in that of England; and Baron Newburgh, of the Isle of Anglesea, in that of Great Britain; he held also the barony of Newborough, of Newborough, county Wexford, in the peer-

age of Ireland. He was a magistrate and Deputy-Lieutenant for Norfolk and Hampshire, and also Joint Hereditary Great Chamberlain of England together with his kinswoman, Lady Willoughby d'Eresby. Lord Cholmondeley married, in February 1825, Miss Marcia Emma Georgina Arbuthnot, daughter of the late Right Hon. Charles Arbuthnot, by whom he had a family of eight children.

Earl of Morton.—The Right Hon. Sholto John Watson Douglas, twentieth Earl of Morton, and also Lord Aberdour and Dalkeith, in the Scottish peerage, was born at Berlin, April 13, 1818, being the eldest son of George, nineteenth Earl, by his marriage with Frances Theodora, eldest daughter of the late Right Hon. Sir George Rose, G.C.H. He was for some time lieutenant in the 11th Hussars, but retired in 1844. He succeeded to the honours of the peerage at his father's death in March 1858; he was a magistrate and Deputy-Lieutenant for Mid Lothian and Argyllshire, and Lieutenant-Colonel Commandant of the Mid Lothian Yeomanry Cavalry. He had been a representative peer for Scotland for a quarter of a century. His lordship was twice married, first, in 1844, to Helen, daughter of the late Mr. James Watson, of Saughton, county Mid Lothian, who died in December 1850; and, secondly, in 1853, to Lady Alice Anne Caroline Lambton, sixth daughter of John George, first Earl of Durham, a lady of the bedchamber to the Princess of Wales. He was succeeded by his only son, by his first marriage, Sholto George Watson, Lord Aberdour, who was born in November 1844, and married, in July 1877, the Hon. Ellen Geraldine Maria Ponsonby, daughter of Lord de Mauley.

During the month the following deaths also took place:—On December 1, at Peshawur, aged 42, **Lieutenant-Colonel Edward George Godolphin Hastings, C.B.**, Judicial Commissioner in India, the son of the late Captain the Hon. Edward Plantagenet R. H. Hastings. He entered the Bengal Army, served with the 21st Hussars in the Hazara campaign of 1868, and was Political Officer during the Afghan war of 1879-80. On December 2, aged 68, **Lieutenant-General Alexander Cunningham Robertson, C.B.**, who beginning his career in the English brigade that served with Dom Pedro in Portugal, and with General Evans in Spain, afterwards entered the Queen's service and served in India and in England. On December 4, at Bristol, aged 79, **Rev. Edward Girdlestone, M.A.**, Senior Residentiary Canon of Bristol Cathedral, and Vicar of Olveston. He was a zealous advocate of the cause of the agricultural labourer, and commenced the plan of removing families from the ill-paid districts of the west of England to the more prosperous and better-paid north. On December 4 **Mrs. Meadows White**, the wife of Frederick Meadows White, Q.C., better known in the musical world as Alice Mary Smith. She was one of the few female composers who attempted the higher forms of orchestral music. On December 5, aged 70, the **Earl of Scarborough**. The son of the late Frederick Lumley, he was formerly in

the 7th Hussars, and succeeded his cousin as ninth Earl of Scarborough in 1856. On December 5, at Kensington, aged 62, **Dr. Augustus Voelcker, F.R.S.**, a native of Frankfort-on-Maine, and educated at the University of Göttingen. He came to England early in life, and became professor of chemistry to the Royal Agricultural Society of Great Britain. He was the author of several important works on theoretical and agricultural chemistry. On December 6, aged 84, **Charles Ross**, whose active career as a journalist extended over sixty-three years, all passed, with a short interval in the reporters' gallery, chiefly in the service of the *Times*, retiring only shortly before his death from the duties of chief of its Parliamentary staff. On December 7, at Lymington, Hants, aged 76, **Felix William George Richard Bedingfield, C.M.G.**, son of Sir Richard Bedingfield, Bart., of Osburgh, Norfolk. He was called to the Bar in 1849, and for nine years acted as private secretary to the Governor of the Leeward Islands, after holding various appointments in the West Indies. He was for many years Colonial Secretary at the Mauritius. On December 8, at Berne, aged 47, **Auguste Bridel**, chief engineer of the St. Gothard Railway. A Swiss by birth, he completed his education in Paris, and was one of the founders and first members of the French Society of Civil Engineers. On December 10, at Berlin, **Dr. Karl Mayer**, Councillor of Legation, formerly librarian to the Prince Consort of England, and after his death occupied a similar position at the Court of Berlin. He acted as reader to the Empress Augusta, and was well known as a philologist. On December 10, at Brighton, aged 74, **Arabella, Lady Northbrook**, the widow of the first Lord Northbrook, some time Chancellor of the Exchequer and First Lord of the Admiralty. She was the daughter of the first Earl of Effingham. On December 10, at Paris, aged 69, **General Fleury**, an ardent Bonapartist, who had held high posts in the late Emperor's household, and was some time Ambassador to St. Petersburg. On December 10, **Lieutenant-Colonel William Kenyon-Slaney**, of Halton Grange and Walford Manor, Shropshire. The son of the Hon. Thomas Kenyon, of Pradoc, Shropshire, he married the daughter of Robert A. Slaney, M.P., of Halton Grange, whose name he assumed. On December 10, at Paris, aged 36, **Bastien Lepage**, the well-known French painter. He commenced life in the public service, but afterwards devoted himself, with great success, to art as a realistic painter. On December 14, at Torquay, **Jane Georgiana, Duchess of Somerset**, wife of the Duke of Somerset. She was the daughter of the late Mr. Thomas Sheridan, and the granddaughter of Richard Brinsley Sheridan. On December 17, at Hamilton, Canada, aged 74, **Rt. Rev. Thomas Brock Fuller, D.D., D.C.L.**, a Canadian by birth and education. After many years in Orders he was ordained first Bishop of the newly created see of Niagara. On December 19, at Pinkieburn, near Edinburgh, aged 76, **Rev. William Lindsay Alexander, D.D.**, the author of a large number of theological works, and a member of the Old Testament Revision Company. On December 19, aged 81, **Venerable Philip Jacob, D.D.**, Archdeacon and Residentiary Canon of Winchester Cathedral. He was the son of Mr. John Jacob, of Guernsey, and held for some time the rectory of Crawley-cum-Hunton, Hants. On December 22, at Croydon, aged 88, **James Balfour**, a Liberal who was one of the escort which accompanied Sir Francis Burdett on his committal to the Tower. He received an appointment in the House of Commons in 1853. On December 23, at Kensington, aged 74, **Rev. W. H. Channing**, a distinguished Unitarian divine. An American by birth, he was ordained at Cincinnati, and came to England in 1854. He returned to America on the outbreak of the civil war; became Chaplain of the House of Representatives, before which he delivered impassioned addresses in the cause of emancipation and the Union. He was an author and a voluminous contributor to periodical literature and a most impressive preacher. On December 24, at Retford, **William Overend, Q.C.**, Benchet of Lincoln's Inn. For several years he acted as Deputy-Chairman of Quarter Sessions for the West Riding, and was the chief commissioner appointed to inquire into the trade outrages at Sheffield.

INDEX.

The figures between [] refer to PART I.

- ABERDARE**, Lord, receives the Grand Cross of the Bath, 53
- ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY**, Prof. Bain elected Lord Rector, 43
- ACCIDENTS**.—Asturian Line, fall of tunnel, 18; Bermondsey, gas explosion, 38; Bilston, boiler explosion, 41; Caledonian Railway, collision, 7; Canadian Trunk Railway, collision, 1; Ciudad Real, fall of bridge, 13; Coppull Station, fall of bridge, 2; Cunningham, St. Louis, fall of bridge, 22; Denmark Hill, tunnel falling in, 15; Dorothea Quarry, fall of rock, 58; Dover express, attempt to wreck, 18; Glasgow Theatre, panic, 40; Hanau, Germany, 42; Madrid, explosion of a bomb, 19; mail train from Dumfries, fell over bridge, 6; New River Company's water main burst, 21; Peniston Railway, axle-bar snapped, 24; Pennsylvania train, burst, 3; Pocahontas Colliery, explosion, 8; Salisbury and Wimborne line, 17; South-Eastern collision, 18; Temesvar Coal-pit, explosion, 49; Tredegar Hochin Colliery, explosion, 41; Treharris Colliery, breaking of rope, 49
- ADAMS v. Coleridge**, case of, 44
- AERONAUTICS**.—Dale's attempt to cross the Firth of Forth, 85; Hythe, Gen. Brine's, ascent from, 28; Meudon, 27; London, centenary of the first ascent from, 34
- AFGHANISTAN**.—Amir's troubles with the different tribes [348]; Ayub Khan's intrigues [345]; British Government, relations with [346]; Frontier Commission [348]; arrival near Herat, 32; Lumsden, Sir Peter, English Representative [348]; Merv, occupation of [348]; Russian encroachment [347]
- AFRICA, SOUTH** [378]. *Vide* Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Cape Colony, Natal, and Zululand
- ALBANY**, Duke of, accident and death at Cannes [188], 9; body brought to England by the Prince of Wales, 10; deposited in the Albert Memorial Chapel, 11; State funeral, 11; his will sworn, 22
- Duchess of, birth of her posthumous son, 25; her infant son christened, 47
- AMERICA**. *Vide* Argentine Republic, Brazil, Chili and Peru, Mexico, Panama, United States, West Indies
- ANHALT**, Prince of, marriage with Princess Elizabeth of Electoral Hesse, 16
- ANNALY**, Lord, receives the ribbon of St. Patrick, 58
- ARGENTINE REPUBLIC**.—Harvest prospects [417]; immigration [417]; La Plata, the new capital [418]; railways [418]
- ARLBERG** Railway, the, opened, 34
- ART**, retrospect of.—**BRITISH** Museum, 82
- FREE SCHOOLS, in water-colour art, in Great Ormond Street, 5
- GROSVENOR Gallery, 82
- NATIONAL Gallery, 82
- OLD MASTERS, winter exhibition of the, 83
- ROYAL Academy exhibition, 83
- SALES, 84
- SOUTH Kensington Museum, 82
- ARTILLERYMAN bitten by an eel, 49
- ASIA, CENTRAL** [346]. Russian encroachments [347]
- ASSOCIATION of Railway Shareholders, meeting for, at Cannon Street Hotel, 1
- ASTON** Park, Birmingham, riots in [227]; Lord R. Churchill on [288]
- AURORA** Borealis, seen in the north of Scotland, 18
- AUSTRALASIA** [423]. *Vide* Fiji, New South Wales, New Zealand, Queensland, Tasmania, Victoria
- AUSTRALIA, SOUTH** [427]. New ministry, the [427]
- AUSTRALIA, WESTERN**, sparseness of the population [428]
- AUSTRIA-HUNGARY**.—**ANARCHISTS**, arrest of the ringleaders, 32; Anti-Socialist decrees [301]
- BALATON Lake frozen, 48; Blösch, the detective, shot dead, 4
- CROATIA**, Radical party in [305]
- DOMRAD, accident to wedding party on the river Theiss, 5. Dynamiters [305]
- ELECTIONS, riots caused by [303]
- FOREIGN policy [305]
- GRATZ, trial of thirty-six Socialists, 20
- HOURS of labour [308]; Hungary, reform of the Upper House [304]
- KOSSUTH, Louis, his manifesto [303]
- VIENNA, hurricane at, 49; Lucas Jauner, suicide, 51; meat supply [302]; H. Stellmacher condemned for the murder of detective Blösch, 18; Woltitz Brothers, suicide of, 52
- AVANTI**, Conte di, marriage with Princess Dolgorouki, 45

- BAKER, Sir Samuel, his letter in the *Times* upon General Gordon's mission [70]
- BANK of England rate of discount raised, 5, 40, 41; reduced, 8, 11
- BANSTEAD, prize fight between Maine and Middings, 35
- BARNER, near Elberfeld, circus struck by lightning, 24
- BARONIES of the United Kingdom conferred on the Earl of Arran and others, 40
- BASUTOLAND [380].—HOSTILITIES in [381]; Sir Hercules Robinson's amended regulations for the Government [381]; estimated revenue [382]
- BATTENBERG, Prince Louis of, married to the Princess Victoria at Darmstadt, 13
- BLATRICK, Princess, engaged to Prince Henry of Battenberg, 53
- BECHUANALAND [378].—BUDGET [379]; new Convention [382]; murder of Mr. Bethell [383]; Mr. Mackenzie's short tenure of office [384]; Sir C. Warren occupies the country [384]
- BELGIUM.—ARMY Reserve [320]
- BRUSSELS, riots at, 18; gathering of the Clerical party, 32; Budget [320]
- COMMUNAL Schools [318]
- EDUCATION Bill, the new, meeting of the Burgomasters, 34
- HOLY See, diplomatic relations with [320]
- LIBERALS, overthrow of the [316]; triumph of [319]
- MINISTRY, the new [317]
- WANNES, near Mons, colliery on fire, 41
- BELT v. Lawes, verdict confirmed by the Court of Appeal, 9
- BERENFORD, Lord Marcus, tried for an assault on Mr. J. Gibson Bowles, 44
- BETHELL, Mr. Christopher, his murder [259]
- BICYCLE race between Lees of Sheffield and Hawker of Leicester, 28
- BILLIARD match at Cambridge, 16; between J. Roberts, jun., and J. G. Sala, 42; at the Westminster Aquarium, 46
- BIRMINGHAM, great Reform demonstration, 27; meeting of the Conservative Association at Aston Park, 37; summonses for libel, 41; Mr. Chamberlain examined, 45; libels, 48
- BISMARCK, Prince, on the annexation of Angta Pequena [268]; resigns the Presidency of the Prussian Ministry, and the Portfolio of Foreign Affairs and Commerce, 10; defeated in the newly elected Reichstag, 46
- BLAINE, Mr. Senator, elected at Chicago, 18
- BOLCKOW, Vaughan, & Co., Messrs., at Eton, closed their works, 52
- BOROUGH Corporations, English, elections for, 40
- BRADFORD, strike among the spinners, 22
- BRADLAUGH, Mr., re-elected for Northampton, 6; v. the Attorney-General, 21; refused a new trial, 48; final judgment deferred, 50
- BRYAN, Sir Henry, retires from the Speakership [50], 7; raised to the Peerage as Viscount Hampden [51]
- BRASSEY, Sir Thomas, Secretary to the Admiralty, 43
- BRAZIL, private emancipation of slaves [416]; financial condition [416]; new coffee tree discovered [417]; European emigration [417]
- BUNYU, Nanjio, received the degree of M.A., *honoris causa*, 9
- BURMAH, rebellion in [351]; massacre in the Mandalay prison [352]; railroad between Pegu and Tonghoo opened halfway [352]
- BURNTISLAND, an apparently dead body of a girl discovered, 45
- BUTCHERS' Company, the, foundation stone laid of their new Hall, 45
- CABLES, the Gould and Mackay-Barnett, unworkable, 36
- CAINE, Mr., Civil Lord of the Admiralty, 43
- CAMBRIDGE, Tercentenary of Emmanuel College, 19; Sexcentenary of Peterhouse celebrated, 51
- CAPE COLONY [378].—BUDGET, state of [379]; riots in the Kimberley diamond-fields [380]
- CATERPILLARS, swarms of, in East Glamorganshire, 19
- CENSURE, Vote of, in the Commons [33] *vide* Parliament
- CHAMBERLAIN, Mr., at Denbigh, 39; examined at Birmingham on charge of libel, 45
- CHANNEL Tunnel Bill rejected, 15
- CHATHAM, riots at, 27
- CHATSWORTH Park, Liberal demonstration at, 37
- CHESTER, Bishopric of, vacant by Dr. Jacobson's resignation, 5; trial at, for a mock marriage, 52
- CHICAGO, the National Democratic Convention at, 23
- CHILDERS, Mr., at Pontefract, 39
- CHILI and PERU, Civil War [419]; Iglesias, Gen., elected president [419]; Trujillo, siege and capture [420]; Bolivia, truce with [420]; national revenue [421]
- CHINA.—BACNINH taken [370], 8
- FOOCHOW, bombardment of [378], 30
- KEELUNG bombarded by the French fleets, 27
- MINGVY and Kinpai forts attacked by the French, 31
- NEGOTIATIONS attempted [375]
- SONTAY, fall of [369]
- TAMBIN, French troops defeated at, 36; Tonquin, the French in [369]
- CHURCHILL, Lord Randolph, at Blackpool, 14; re-elected chairman of the National Union of Conservative Associations, 16; at Leeds, 36
- CHURCH Missionary Society, annual meeting of, 14
- CHOLERA, outbreak of.—Genoa, 35; Naples, 33; Paris, 41; Piedmont, 30; Spezia, 30; Toulon, 20; Yport, Normandy, 39
- CITY Ratepayers, meeting of the, 14
- CLEATOR Moor, Protestant demonstration at, 24

CONFERENCE, at Westminster Hotel to promote friendly relations between Great Britain and her colonies, 26; on Egypt proposed [64]; adjourned *sine die*, 26

CONGO, the [395]; Brazza, M. de, his relations and settlements [396]; navigation and commerce [395]

CONSERVATIVE gathering at Hatfield, 81; leaders, conference of, at Gordon Castle, 87; meeting at the Carlton Club, 43

COPPÉE, M. F., received at the French Academy, 50

CORNEILLE, Pierre, bicentenary anniversary of his death, 35

CORNWALL, Mr., action against Mr. O'Brien, M.P., 22

COWFER, Lord, his "compromise" [199]

CREMATION, attempted by Dr. Price on the body of his child at Llantrissant, 2; Dr. Cameron's Bill for legalising, negatived, 13; of the body of an Indian Rajah at Etretat, 81

CREMATORIUM at the Ilford Cemetery, meeting of the City Commissioners of Sewers, 10

CRICKET.—Australians, the, complete their fourth tour in England, 33; Australians and an English eleven, 16; England and Australians at Lord's, 25; at the Kennington Oval, 26, 28; Eton and Harrow, 23; Marylebone Club defeated by the Australians, 16; University match, 21

CRIMINAL CASES.—CASEY, Thomas, his perjury [287]

DALY, Egan, and McDonnell tried for treason-felony, 26. Denman, Egan, and Fitzgerald arrested for dynamite outrages, 12. Dudley and Stephens tried for the murder of Parker, 32; found guilty, 47; sentence of death passed, 48

EWERSTADT hanged for the murder of the woman Hamilton, 48

FLANAGAN, C., and M. Higgins sentenced to death, 6

GIBBONS, Mrs., convicted of the murder of her husband, 51; sentence commuted, 53

HENSCH, Capt., sentenced to nine years' penal servitude, 15. Howarth, K., and H. Hammond executed, 45. Hoxton, two policemen shot by burglars, 24. Hugues, Madame Clovis, shoots a detective, 46

JEREZ, seven men executed by the garrote, 19

KEYSE, Miss, murdered at Babbacombe, 43. Kraszewski, sentenced to three and a half years' imprisonment, 14

LEIPZIG, trial of the men who attempted the Emperor of Germany's life, 50, 51

NASH and Gunnell conspire to forge J. Whalley's will, 47

ORROCK, T. H., charged with the murder of George Cole, 30; sentenced, 34; hanged, 36

PARK Club proprietor and members convicted of keeping a gambling-house, 5. Phoenix Park convicts removed to Chatham prison, 5

RAYS, Marquis de, sentenced to four years' imprisonment, 1

SHAW, A., hanged at Liverpool, 48. So-

CRIMINAL CASES, *continued*

cialists, German, arrested at New York, 27. Stellmacher hanged at Vienna, 27

WOLFF and Bondurand, trial, 8. Wright, J., and W. Wheatley sentenced, 34

CYCLONES.—Georgia and Alabama, 6; Iceland, 33; Indiana, 10, 31; Madras, 44; Sicily, 36; United States, 10; Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa, 33

DEE, the River, its ebb and flow, 7

DELEGATES, Liberal, meeting of, at St. James's Hall, 26

DEMONSTRATIONS. — Birmingham, 27; Chatsworth Park, 37; Cleaton Moor, 24; Dromore, 1; Glasgow, 24, 32; London, 25; Manchester, 27; Nostell Priory, 30

DENMAN, Mr. Justice, guarded by police, 2

DENMARK.—BUDGET [335]

CONSTITUTIONAL struggles [335]

LANDSTING, the [337]. Literary Left, the [337]

RIGSDAG, the, assembling of [336]

SCHLESWIGIANS, the, persecuted by the Prussian authorities [337]

DILKE, Sir Charles, at Kensington, 39

DRAMA, THE.—Comic Operetta, 88; Opera bouffe, 88; original work and adaptations, 85, 86; revivals, 88; Salvini's impersonations, 89; Shakespearean revivals, 89

DUELA. — Pinto, Major S., and Visconde Roboredo, Lisbon, 8; Rochefort, M., and Capt. Fournier, Paris, 37; Scholl, M. A., and M. Dion, Paris, 2

DUFFERIN, Lord, Viceroy of India, 33

DYNAMITE.—Carlton Club, 17; case containing 2 cwt. landed at Dover, 50; Edinburn House, near Tralee, 46; Herbert of Lea's statue at Salisbury, 24; infernal machine addressed to the Comte de Paris, 8; Kasan powder magazine, 28; London Bridge, 49; plots for blowing up Victoria, Paddington, Charing Cross, and Ludgate Hill Stations [160], 7; Quebec Parliament buildings, 14; Royton Town Hall, 45; Salisbury Council House, 35; Scotland Yard, 17; Toronto, cartridges discovered in the Parliament buildings, 14; Victoria Station, 7

EADE, Capt. J., medal awarded by the Society of Arts, 18

EARTHQUAKES. — Albano, 27; Alleghany Hills, the, 34; Andalusia, 52; Austria, Lower, 31; Clitheroe, 42; Concord, New Hampshire, 45; Eastern Counties, 12; Forio, Island of Ischia, 25; Frascati, 27; Geneva, 46; Jersey, Island of, 30; Madrid, 52; New York, extending to the Alleghanies, 27; Spain, South of, 53

ECCLESIASTICAL.—CARPENTER, Rev. Boyd, Bishop of Ripon, 16. Church Congress at Carlisle, 35

IRNAD-UD-DIN, Rev., degree of D.D. conferred on him, 29

ECCLESIASTICAL, continued

- JACOBSON, Dr., resigns the Bishopric of Chester, 5
 LINCOLN, Bishop of, resignation, 50.
 Linton, Dr. Sydney, Bishop of Riverina, New South Wales, 14
 RIDDING, Dr., Bishop of Southwell, 6; consecrated, 14
 St. PAUL's Cathedral, special service to commemorate the consecration of Bp. Seabury, 43
 SOUTHWELL, the Bishopric of, founded, 5
 TRENCH, Bishop, resignation, 46
 ECCLESIASTICAL Commissioners, the, financial position of, 40
 ECLIPSE of the moon, 36
 EDINBURGH, Duchess of, gave birth to a daughter, 12
 — University, celebration of the tercentenary of its foundation, 12
 EGYPT.—AFFAIRS in, 11; Baker Pasha's defeat [889], 6; Berber, fall of [892]; Cairo, judgment given in the action brought by the Caisse of the Public Debt, 48; Conference [893], 21; Finances, state of [893]; Gordon despatched to [888]; at Khartoum [891]; Graham defeats Osman Digna at Trinkitat [891], 7; insolvency of [64]; Lloyd, Mr. Clifford, dismissed from office [893]; Northbrook, Lord, sent to Cairo [894]; Sinkat, fall of [889]; Soudan, condition of [887]; Teb, battle of [890]; Wady Garna, Col. J. D. Stewart, M. Herbin, and others murdered, 36; Wolseley, Lord, expedition up the Nile [894]; leaves Cairo for Khartoum, 36; leaves Korti, 53
 ELEPHANT, the white, Mr. Barnum's, at the Zoological Gardens, 3

FALMOUTH, Lord, his racing stud sold, 13, 21

FARMERS' Representative Conference, 48

FEARON, Rev. W. A., Head Master of Winchester College, 8

FENIANISM in London [162]

FIJI [484]; labour question [484]; petition for a change in form of government [484]

FINNY, Miss, obtains £10,000 damages from Lord Garmoyle, 44

FIRES.—ATHENS, Royal Palace, 27; old market, 30

“AURORA” ship, Calcutta, 6

BELLEVILLE, Illinois, 1

CANFORD Manor, Dorset, 2

CARK, near Barrow-in-Furness, 11

CARTHAGE, New York, 39

CITY Road, 48

CLARE Market, 53

“CLARENCK” Reformatory Ship, 3

CLEVELAND, Ohio, 1, 33

COPENHAGEN, Royal Palace, 36

CORNHILL, 8

DALSTON, timber yard, 50

DUDEE, 46

EDINBURGH, Theatre Royal, 21

GLASGOW, 43

HAMMERSMITH, timber yard, 42

ISLINGTON, Agricultural Hall, 52

FIRES, continued

- LAMBETH Linoleum Works, 8
 LIVERPOOL, cotton warehouse, 16
 MADRID, Royal Armoury, 23
 MILE END Road, 3
 MONTAGUE Street, Whitechapel, 52
 MOORFIELDS, Roman Catholic Cathedral, 34
 NEWCASTLE, Free Library, 45
 NEW YORK, Theatre, 52
 OLD BAILEY, Bell Tavern, 13
 PATERNOSTER Row, 10
 PECKHAM, 53
 PORTOBELLO, Middie Collieries, 16
 PORT OF SPAIN, Trinidad, 4
 St. JOHN's Catholic Orphan Asylum, 50
 St. MARTIN'S-LE-GRAND, General P. Office, 32
 SHEERNESS, 48
 SHOREDITCH, East London Aquarium, SOUTHWARK Street, Borough, 46
 STROOD Oil Mills, 42
 SWAKELEYS, near Uxbridge, 53
 TRESVAR, Hungary, 82
 VIENNA, Stadttheater, 15
 WALTHAM Cross Railway Station, 12
 WANDSWORTH Lunatic Asylum, 34
 WANSTEAD Park Grotto, 44
 WESTBOURNE Grove, Whiteley's, 13
 WETHAM Hall, East Riding, 3
 WILTON Road, Pimlico, 28
 WINDSOR Station, 61
 FISHERIES EXHIBITION, the, surplus after paying all expenses, 9
 FLOODS.—Derbyshire, 5; Europe, Central, 20; Galicia and Eastern Europe, 20; Russian Poland, 20; Western States, various parts of, 6
 FONTAINE Collection, the, sale concluded, 19
 FOWLER, Mr. H. H., Under Secretary of State for the Home Department, 49
 FOXES, poisoning of, in Ireland, 47
 FRANCE.—ABOUT, Edmond, elected member of the French Academy, 4. Algeria, discontent in [281]. Army Organization Bill [278]
 BRAZZA, M., mission to the Gaboon country [282]; Budget [282]
 CHINESE campaign [280]. Colonial policy [279]. Committee to inquire into the condition of the working classes, 30. Constitution, revision of [275]. Coppée, François, elected successor to V. Laprade, 6
 INDUSTRIAL Commission, the [271]
 LESSEPS, M., elected successor to Henri Martin, 6
 MUNICIPAL Law Bill, the [271]
 PARIS, cholera, outbreak of, 41; elections to the vacant *fauteuils*, 48; national fête, disturbances at, 24; socialists and police, encounter between, 45
 ROYALIST propaganda [278]
 SENATE, reform of the [278]
 VERSAILLES, congress of the two French Chambers, 27; vintage of 1883, statistics of the, 2
 FREEMAN, Mr. E. A., Regius Professor of History at Oxford, 9
 FRERE, Sir Bartle; his interment at St. Paul's, 18

GEORGE, Mr. Henry, addresses a meeting at St. James's Hall, 2
 GERMAN flag hoisted in New Guinea, New Ireland, and various other islands, 51
 GERMANY.—ANGRA Pequena [297]
 BERLIN, conference on Western Africa, 48; St. George's Memorial Church, foundation stone laid, 16; Dr. Lasker's funeral, 4. Bismarck, Prince, and Dr. Lasker [295]
 COLONIAL policy [296]; Congo, the [297]
 ELECTIONS for the new Reichstag [293]; Explosives Bill, the [292]
 FRANCE, relations with [299]
 HOUSES of Parliament, foundation stone laid by the Emperor, 18
 KRASZEWSKI, trial of [295]
 LEIPZIG, trial of the Anarchists for high treason and conspiracy, 50, 51
 NATIONAL Liberal Party [291]
 REINSDORF and his accomplices [292]
 SOCIALISM, law against [291]; States Council, new Prussian [293]
 WORKING Men's Insurance Bill [289]
 GLADSTONE, Mr., in Midlothian, 31; his address in Edinburgh, 31
 GLASGOW, Protestant Demonstration near, 24; in favour of the Franchise Bill, 82; meeting of the University Council, 40; Prof. Lushington elected Lord Rector, 48; Earl of Stair Chancellor, 44
 GORDON, General; his mission to the Congo River, 2; despatched to Egypt, 8; mission to Khartoum [11]
 GRAHAM, General; his victory over Osman Digna, and capture of the camp at Tamasi, 8
 GREECE, parliamentary crisis in [311]
 GREEK Expedition, the (U.S.), rescued by the *Thetis* and *Bear*, 20
 GREENWICH, the "universal day" adopted by the Astronomer Royal, 53
 GUILDHALL, meeting at, to protest against the Government policy for Egypt, 6; new Council Chamber opened, 36
 HAGUE, Hygienic Congress at, 30
 HALLETT, Mr. Holt, and party reach Bangkok, 23
 HAMILTON Library sale concluded, 14
 HANAU, Prince H. of, received into the Roman Catholic Church, 18
 HARCOURT, Sir W., and the deputation from the metropolitan vestries, 8
 HEALTH Exhibition, the International, opened at South Kensington, 14; closed, 40
 HEIDELBERG University, authorities of, decline to throw it open to women, 28
 HEREDITARY Legislative Chamber, meeting of the People's League for the abolition of, 45
 HESSE, Grand Duke of, his reported marriage to Madam Kolomine, 13; separation decreed, 23; dissolution of his marriage confirmed by the Supreme Tribunal, 38
 — Princess Elizabeth of, married to the Grand Duke Sergius Alexandrovitch at St. Petersburg, 19
 HORNBY, Rev. Dr., Provost of Eton, 30

HOUSE OF LORDS, the, demonstration of artisans and labourers condemning the action of, 25
 HOUSING of the Working Classes, Royal Commission to inquire into, 18
 HOWANEER, arrested on the *Lord Clive*, and released, 88
 HYDERABAD, disturbances at, 40
 ICE, lives lost in S.W. Lancashire, 52
 IMPERIAL Federation League, the, meeting at the Westminster Palace Hotel, 43
 INDIA [350].—AGOR, raids by the Chagarzais [354]. AKKA tribes, submission of [350]. ASSESSMENT of land [362]
 BALUCHISTAN, disputes in [354]. BURMESE rebellion [351]
 COMMERCE [364]
 ESTIMATES revised for 1883-84 [359]; for 1884-85 [361]. EXCHIEF [360]
 FEUDATORY States:—Hyderabad [355]; Indore [356]; Junagadh [356]; Kolhapur [356]; Rajputana [356]. FINANCE [358, 359]. FORESTS, receipts from [360]. FRONTIER disturbance [353]
 HEALTH, epidemics and season [365]
 INTERNATIONAL Exhibition [366]
 KHAIBAR, border raids [354]
 LEGISLATION [356]
 NIPAL, relations with Thibet [350]
 OPIUM crop [360]. ORNAMENTS, gold and silver, sent to the mint for coinage [361]
 PUBLIC opinion, state of [366]. PUBLIC works [363]
 RAILWAYS [360]. RIPON, Lord, resignation [355]; his tours [366]
 SALT tax [360]. SWAT, disturbances in [354]
 INTERNATIONAL HEALTH EXHIBITION, the, closed, 40
 IRELAND.—DUBLIN, funeral procession for Denis Duggin, 33; the name of Sackville Street changed to O'Connell, 47
 FRANCHISE, the New [124]
 MAAMTRASNA murders, the [236]
 NEWRY, Nationalist meeting at, 18
 OUTRAGES in, 34
 REPRESENTATION of [101]
 ROSSMORE, Lord, dismissal [24]
 ULSTER, Orange demonstrations near, 23
 ISLEWORTH, scheme of constructing a lock at, 2
 ITALY.—BUDGET [286]
 CHOLERA in [288]
 DEPRETIS, M., illness [286]
 EDUCATION Act, the Higher [285]. ENGLAND, relations with [288]
 GENOA, outbreak of cholera, 35
 NAPLES, cholera at, 33
 RAILWAYS Bill, the [289]
 ROME, Vatican, the, disturbances in the neighbourhood, 24. Victor Emmanuel's remains translated to the Pantheon, 2; number of pilgrimages to his tomb, 2

JAPAN [376].—ARMY, the [377]
 COREA, rebellion in [377]

JAPAN, continued

RAILWAYS [877]. REVENUE and Expenditure [876]

JOHNSON, Dr. Samuel, centenary of his death, 49

JUBILEE year, the, of the abolition of slavery, commemoration of, at the Guildhall, 26

KIDDERMINSTER, riots at, 12; outbreak of typhoid fever, 34

KOLOMINK, Madame, her morganatic marriage annulled, 17; decree of divorce confirmed, 51

LAUDERDALE, Earl of, struck by lightning, 28

LAW Courts, opened, 39

LAWN Tennis tournament, Northern, at Liverpool, 20; Championship contest at Wimbledon, 24

LEIGH Court Gallery of Pictures sold, 21

LICHFIELD, disgraceful proceedings of the Royal Staffordshire Yeomanry, 18

LITERATURE, retrospect of, 54. WORKS OF THE SEASON, principal:—

ADDIS and Arnold, the "Catholic Dictionary," 76. Ashton, "English Caricature and Satire on Napoleon I.," 77

BARTLETT, Rev. W. A., "The Profitableness of the Old Testament Scriptures," 78. Bauer, Caroline, Posthumous memoirs of, 61. "Bloomfield, Benjamin Lord," 61. Boulger, "History of China," 69. Brassey, Lady, "In the Trades, the Tropics, and the Roaring Forties," 73. Brewer, Dr., "Dictionary of Miracles," 77. Brown, Horatio, "Life on the Lagoons," 72. Browning, "Ferishtah's Fancies," 63

CANNING, A. S. E., "Hints on Shakspeare," 75. Cole, "Fifty Years of Public Work," 61. Colebrooke, "Mountstuart Elphinstone," 55. Crawford, "Across the Pampas and the Andes," 72. Croft, Miss, "Chapters in the History of English Literature," 75

DOBSON, "Bewick and his Pupils," 61

EASTLAKE, Charles, "Old Pinakothek at Munich," 75. "Eminent Women Series," 62. Enfield, "Leaves from the Diary of Henry Greville," 59

FROUDE, "Thomas Carlyle," 56

GALLENGA, "Episodes of my Second Life," 58. Garnault, P., and E. Garnier, "French Pottery," 74. Gordon-Cumming, Miss, "In the Himalayas and on the Indian Plains," 73

HARROP's "Bolingbroke," 70. Hare, "Cities of Northern and Central Italy," 71. Hawkins, Mr., "Annals of the French Stage," 77. Hawthorne, "Nathaniel Hawthorne and his Wife," 59.

Hickson, Miss, "Ireland in the Seventeenth Century," 69. Horner, Miss, "Walks in Florence and its Environs," 71

IGRAM, "Haunted Homes," 76

LITERATURE, continued

JENNINGS, "Correspondence and Diaries of the late John Wilson Croker," 54. Jerrold, Blanchard, "At Home in Paris," 74. Jones, Dr. Macnaughten, "The Health of the Seneca," 76

LANG, "Custom and Myth," 78. Lang, Andrew, "Rhymes à la Mode," 68. Lee, Vernon, "Euphorion," 79. Luckock, Canon, "The Footprints of the Son of Man," 73

MALLESON, Col., "Battle-fields of Germany," 71; Malmesbury, Lord, "Memoirs of an Ex-Minister," 54. "Maritime Alps and their Seaboard," 73. Marvin, Charles, "The Region of Eternal Fire," 72. Maskell, Alfred, "Russian Art," 75. "Maurice, Life of F. D.," 56. McCarthy, Justin, "History of the Four Georges," 70. Medd, Rev. P. G., "The One Mediator," 73. "Military Biographies," 71. Mitchell, Mrs., "Ancient Sculpture," 80. Mitford, "A Land March from England to Ceylon," 72. "Mozley, Letters of the Rev. J. B.," 60. Müller, "Biographical Essays," 61

ORNSBY, "Memoirs of Mr. Hope-Scott of Abbotsford," 59

"PARCHMENT Library Series," 77. Payn, "Literary Recollections," 57. Pidgeon, Daniel, "Old-World Questions and New-World Answers," 73. Playfair, Col., "The Scourge of Christendom," 70. Potter, Miss, "A Lady's Ride across Spanish Honduras," 72

REID, "Sketch of the Life and Times of Sydney Smith," 60. Robinson, Miss, "New Arcadia, and other Poems," 68

"SOUTH Kensington Museum Art Handbooks," 74. Stanford, Mr., "Europe," 81. Sully, Mr., "Outlines of Psychology," 81. Swinburne, "A Midsummer Holiday," 62. Symonds, J. A., "Vagabunduli Libellus," 66

TAYLOR, J. E., "The Sagacity and Morality of Plants," 76. Tennyson, "Beckett," 64. Toynbee, Mr., "Lectures on the Industrial Revolution in England," 78

WARD, "Dr. Humphry Sandwith," 60. Ward, Wilfrid, "Wish to Believe," 73. Wilcocks, J. C., "The Sea Fisherman," 76. Williams, "Memoirs of Life and Work," 57. Wood, Rev. J. G., "Petland Revisited," 76. Woolner's "Silenus," 67

YATES, "Experience and Recollections," 58

LIVERPOOL, six lads convicted of setting fire to the ship *Clarence*, 6

LOCH, Sir Henry B., appointed Governor of Victoria, 10

LOCUSTS, flights of, in Spain, 29

LONDON Financial Association v. Kelk, judgment given, 8

— Trades Council, meeting of the, in Hyde Park, 37

LONGFELLOW, Mr. Brock's bust of, unveiled in Poets' Corner, 7

LORD Mayor's Show, the, 41

LYTTON, the late Lord, injunction restraining the publication of his letters, 41

MAAMTRASNA murders, the [236]
MADAGASCAR [396].—FRENCH advance in [396]; Shaw, Mr., detention of, [396]
MALET, Sir Edward, ambassador at Berlin, 33
MANCHESTER, Conservative demonstration at, 27
 — Ship Canal Bill, 16, 26
MANORHAMILTON church blown down, 4
MANSION HOUSE, meeting at the, to promote a British Commercial Geographical Society, 40
MARLBOROUGH, Duke of, petitions the Court of Chancery for permission to sell the Blenheim pictures, 16
MARRIOTT, Mr. W. T., applies for the Chiltern Hundreds, 6
MASS meeting, Radical, in Hyde Park [152]
MEAT, frozen, from Australia and New Zealand, increased trade, 2
MEXICO [408].—DIAZ, Gen., elected President [412]; diplomatic relations with England, renewal of [408]; Financial difficulties [411]; mercantile marine [410]; nickel money, forced circulation [409]; Railway, the Central [410]
 — Pyramid, in a forest in the district of Sonora, 2
 “**MIGNONETTE**,” the yacht, case of, the murder of Parker, 32, 41; Dudley and Stephens found guilty, 47; sentence of death passed, 48; commuted to six months’ imprisonment, 49
MITT, “General,” his marriage to Miss Millie Edwards, 17
MONTEAGLE, Lord, receives the ribbon of St. Patrick, 58
MÜLLER, Miss, her furniture distrained for taxes, 22
MUSIC, retrospect of.—BACH Choir, 93
 BENEDICT’s, Sir Julius, Concerts, fiftieth anniversary, 93
 Bow and Bromley Institute, 94
 COVENT Garden, 90
 CRYSTAL Palace, 93
 DRURY Lane, 89
 LONDON Musical Society, 93
 NORWICH Festival, 94
 PHILHARMONIC Society, 92
 POPULAR Concerts, 91
 RICHTER Concerts, 92
 ROYAL Albert Hall Choral Society, 92
 — English Opera Company, 89
 SACRED Harmonic Society, 93
 WORCESTER Festival, 94

NAPOLEON, Prince Victor, and his father, letters published in the *Figaro*, 20
NATAL and Zululand [385]; Cetewayo’s death [385]; Dinizulu crowned king [385]; reserve territory [385]; Boer Republic established [386]; Legislative Council opened [386]; St. Lucia, English flag hoisted [387]
NATIONAL collections of the metropolis, Lord Thurlow’s motion for opening, 9
 — Liberal Club, foundation stone laid by Mr. Gladstone, 41

NATIONAL Liberal Federation, the, at Leeds, 36
 — Union of Conservatives, held its annual conference at Sheffield, 25
NETHERLANDS.—ANTWERP, riots at, 18; Atchin, detention of the *Nisero* crew [322]
 BUDGET [322]
 LUXEMBOURG, elections in [323]
 ORANGE, Prince of, death [321]
 REGENCY of Queen Emma, 322
 SUCCESSION, law of [321]
NEW GUINEA [432]. See Papua
NEW ORLEANS, the World’s Industrial Exhibition opened by President Arthur, 50
NEW SOUTH WALES [425]; Federation Scheme [427]; finances, state of [426]; land question, the [425]; Government railway policy [427]
NEW YORK Stock Exchange, financial panic, 15
NEW ZEALAND [430]; Maori King, his visit to England [430]; Ministerial crisis [431]; North Island, opening of, for roads and railways [430]; revenue and expenditure [432]
NICARAGUA, treaty with the United States for the construction of a canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans [422]
NITRO-GLYCERINE, three packets found at the Nottingham Post Office, 27
NORTHBROOK, Earl of, left London for Egypt, 31
NORTHCOTE, Sir Stafford, at Edinburgh, 34; at Newcastle-on-Tyne, 85; at a meeting of the Committee of the Cabinet on Redistribution, 45
NORWAY.—FRANCHISE, the extension of [341]
 MINISTRY, the, condemned [339]; a new one formed [341]
 SELMER, Mr., impeached [338]; resigns [339]; Storting, the, prorogued [341]
NOSTELL Priory, gathering of Conservatives at [201]
NUSSEERABAD artillery barracks struck by lightning, 30

OBITUARY.—ABINGDON, Earl of, 119; Achard, Alexis J., 159; Aiken, Major W., 129; Albany, the Duke of, 126; Alexander, Rev. W. L., 168; Ampthill, Lord, 151; Anderson, Rev. A., 160; Anna of Austria, Empress, 139; An-sah, Prince, 164; Anstruther, Major-General P., 123; Archibald, Sir E. M., 122; Arran, Earl of, 141
 BAGOT, Rev. C. W. 156; Balfour, Dr. J. H., 122; Balfour, James, 168; Banttry, Earl of, 113; Barker-Mill, Lady Jane, 112; Bass, M. T., 134; Bauer, Vassily V., 164; Bayley, Sir E. C., 136; Baynes, E. D., 163; Beddingfield, Felix W. G. R., 168; Bentham, George, 156; Bentheim, Gen. F. von, 158; Bernstein, Dr. A., 122; Bethune, Admiral C. R. D., 122; Billio, Cardinal, 118; Birch, Rev. H., 142; Bird, W.,

OBITUARY, *continued*

118; Bishop, Madame Anna, 129; Bittenfeld, Field-marshal H. von, 155; Blair, Willie, 164; Blewitt, Octavian, 163; Boeder, General von, 164; Bohn, H. G., 168; Bonham-Carter, J., 165; Borel, General, 128; Boulthbee, Rev. T. P., 114; Bragge, W., 141; Brehm, Dr. A., 164; Brett, Lieut.-General W. F., 164; Bridel, Auguste, 168; Brochet, Antoine, 155; Brown, Rev. J. B., 141; Brown, W. W., 165; Browne, Dr. J. C., 158; Brunswick, Duke of, 156; Buccleugh, Duke of, 132; Buckman, J., 165; Bullar, General Sir G., 185; Byles, Sir J. Barnard, 117; Byron, Henry J., 185

CALVERLEY, C. S., 128; Calvert, J. S., 147; Cesareo, Count G. M., 147; Channing, Rev. W. H., 168; Chenery, T., 119; Cholmondeley, Marquess of, 166; Claughton, Bishop P. C., 152; Codrington, Sir W., 147; Collins, Thomas, 165; Corkran, J. F., 122; Costa, Sir M., 183; Cotton, Admiral F. V., 114; Cowley, Earl, 144; Craven, Augustus, 159; Currie, Major-General A. A., 140; Cust, Henry F. C., 185; Czulczewski, Major Charles, 160

DACRES, Admiral Sir S. C., 129; Dameth, Claude, M. H., 162; Darley, Right Rev. J. R., 118; Davenport, W. B., 141; Davis, Hewitt, 147; Domville, Sir C. C. W., 146; Droop, Henry R., 129; Drummond-Hay, Sir E. H., 118; Dumas, Jean B., 129; Dumont, A. A., 118; Dunally, Dowager Lady, 122; Dymoke, Lady Emma, 146

EDWARDS, Very Rev. H. T., 140; Ellsler, Fanny, 165; Elton, Eliza Dowager Lady, 112; England, General P. V., 164; Ewart, Vice-Admiral C. J., 146

FALKLAND, Viscount, 124; Farnham, Lord, 141; Fawcett, Right Hon. H., 160; Ferrers, Marmion E., 168; Fleming, Sir V., 160; Fleury, General, 168; Forbes, Sir C. J., 147; Freake, Sir C. J., 159; Freeman, J. E., 164; Frere, Sir Bartle, 186; Fuller, Right Rev. Thomas B., 168

GARDEN, Rev. F., 189; Gaskell, Rev. W., 141; Geibel, Emmanuel, 185; Gibson, Right Hon. T. Milner, 121; Giles, Rev. J. A., 156; Girdlestone, Rev. E., 167; Glyn, Vice-Admiral Henry C., 122; Godwin-Austen, R. C., 165; Goodford, Rev. C. O., 139; Grant, Sir A., 165; Grosvenor, Earl, 111; Guyot, Professor A. H., 122

HAMILTON, Lord Claud, 140; Hansell, Rev. E. H., 139; Harris, John, 112; Harvey, Sir G. F., 168; Hastings, Lieut.-Colonel E. G. G., 167; d'Haussonville, Count J. O., 140; Hawkins, Cæsar, 147; Hayward, Abraham, 114; Hayward, H., 164; Hanley, Right Hon. J. W., 165; Hertford, Marquess of, 112; Hildebrand, Professor, 159; Holl, Francis, A.R.A., 118; Holland, Ellen J., 165; Hornby, W. H., 156; Horne, Richard H., 129; Hullah, Dr., 120

OBITUARY, *continued*

JACOB, Ven. Philip, 168; Jacobson, Dr., Bishop of Chester, 143; Jebb, Lady Amelia R., 112; Jenks, Professor J. B., 152; Jephson, Sir J. S., 164; Jerrold, W. Blanchard, 124

KENNEDY, Dr., 186; Kennedy, Mrs., 163; Kenyon-Slaney, Lieut.-Col. W., 168; Kerr, Lady Henry, 118; Keshub Chunder Sen, 111; Kuranda, Herr Ignace, 185

LACROIX, Paul, 159; Laalett, W., 113; Laube, Heinrich, 152; Lauderdale, Earl of, 149; Law, Very Rev. H., 165; Lawrence, General Sir G., 162; Leigh, Hon. G. H. C., 156; Lepage, Bastien, 168; Lepsius, Prof. Kahl R., 146; Letscher, Ex-Governor, 122; Levinge, Sir R. G. A., 156; Litton, Maria, 135; Livesey, Joseph, 158; Lloyd, J. H., 147; Lockwood, General Sir G. H., 186; Londonderry, Dowager Marchioness of, 155; Londonderry, Marquess of, 160; Longay, Count, 164; Longfield, Right Hon. Mountford, 161; Ludwigen, Anna K. ("Anna" of Schleswick-Holstein), 147; Lusignan, Col. L. de, 151; Lyttelton, Hon. and Rev. Canon, 147

MACKENZIE, Colonel F. J. N., 164; Mackinnon, Major-General D. H., 141; Maclean, Admiral A., 164; Makart, Herr, 159; Manby, Charles, 147; Manningham-Bulwer, Colonel F. C., 112; Maret, M., Archbishop of Lepanto, 141; Maret, Sir R. P., 164; Mayer, Dr. Karl, 168; McCormick, Hon. C., 140; Merewether, C. G., 141; Merrifield, C. W., 112; Midhat Pasha, 188; Mignet, Francois, 125; Mitford, Percy, 141; Moizin, Abbé, 146; Moreno, Juan L., Archbishop of Toledo, 153; Morice Bey, J. A., 122; Morphy, Paul, 146; Morton, Earl of, 167; Mostyn, Lord, 125; Motterham, J., 156; Mouncel, Count T. de, 123; Murray, Hon. E. A., 141

NAPIER, Sir J., 164; Nicholas, Captain R. G., 118; Nittis, Joseph de, 153; North, Baroness, 124; Northbrook, Lady A., 168; Nugent, Major-General St. George M., 139; Nugent, General Ch. L., 168

O'BRIEN, Captain P., 156; Orange, the Prince of, 140; Overend, William, 168

PALMER, John H., 140; Pardon, G. F., 152; Parker, J. H., 114; Pasley, Sir J. S., 122; Pattison, Rev. Mark, 145; Peel, Sir Lawrence, 147; Petre, Lord, 146; Philippoteaux, E., 164; Philippe, Col. J. A. L., 141; Phillips, Wendell, 118; Plowden, C., 123; Pollak, Herr Adolph Ritter 141; Porter, Rufus, 155; Preti, Giovanni, 189; Pye, Henry, 118

RADCLIFFE, J. N., 154; Raglan, Lord, 186; Ratisbonne, Theodore de, 113; Reade, Charles, 180; Regnier, Adolphe, 160; Reichardt, Gustave, 163; Reichensfels, Baron von, 156; Ribbing, Comte A. de Leuven, 155; Richards, Lieut.-Gen. R., 164; Ripon, Bishop of, 131;

OBITUARY, *continued*

- Robertson, Lieut.-General A., 167; Rogers (Bey), Edward T., 141; Rozen, Baron A., 139; Ross, Charles, 168; Ross, George, 153; Rothschild, Charlotte Baroness de, 125; Rouher, Eugene, 115; Russell, General Sir D., 113
- SANDWICH, Earl of, 123; Sargent, Rev. J. P., 129; Scarborough, Earl of, 167; Schimpff, General B. von, 159; Schmidt, Dr. J. G., 122; Schramm, General, 123; Scott, Sir Arthur D. B., 129; Scudamore, Frank J., 122; Seafeld, Dow. Countess of, 155; Seafeld, Earl of, 128; Sebright, Sir Charles, 159; Sella, Quintino, 129; Sempill, Baroness, 156; Seton, Sir James L., 156; Simmons, Rev. T. F., 156; Sladen, Sir Charles, 123; Smith, Bishop B. B., 140; Smith, Dr. R. A., 140; Somerset, Duchess of, 168; Sowerby, G. B., 147; Squire, Peter, 135; Stafford Jerningham, Baron Henry V., 165; Stanley, Colonel the Hon. Charles J. F. S., 159; Stanley, Hon. W. O., 123; Steele, Lieut.-General Augustus F., 122; Stieglitz, Baron, 164; Stopford, Viscountess, 153; Stourdza, Prince Michael, 139; Stretton, Lieut.-Colonel S. W. L., 165; Strousberg, Dr. H. B., 140; Struckburgh, Sir G. T. F., 118; Sullivan, Alexander, 158; Suttie, Captain G., 123; Synge, Sir Edward, 113
- TAGLIONI, Paul, 112; Talbot, Rev. the Hon. A. C., 113; Taylor, General Pringle, 135; Teissier, J. F., Baron de, 153; Thénard, Baron, 152; Thynne, Lord Edward, 122; Todd, Alpheus, 113; Todleben, General Count, 142; Torrens, Sir R. M., 153; Torrington, Viscount, 136; Townsend, Rev. R., 160; Travers, General J. 135; Trübner, Nicholas, 128; Turner, Lieut.-General N. O. S., 122
- ULMANN, Benjamin, 123; Urach, Countess Alexandrina von, 153; Usedom, Count Guido, 113
- VANDENSWEER, M., 139; Vara, Giovanni B., 136; Voelcker, Dr. A., 168; Voelker, Professor Karl, 159; Venevitinoff, Madame Appoline, 156; Voisius, Dow. Countess Gilbert de, 136; Voivodsky, Admiral Stephen, 156
- WAGRAM, Duchess of, 136; Walker, Dr. G. A., 146; Warde, General Sir E., 141; Wellington, Duke of, 150; Wharcliffe, Lady, 153; White, Mrs. Meadows, 167; Wigan, Mrs. Alfred, 136; Williams, Dr. S. Wells, 123; Williams, Justice Sir C. J. W., 145; Williams-Bulkeley, Sir R. M. L., 113; Wilson, Sir Erasmus, 148; Winkworth, Susanna, 163; Woodward, Dr., 154; Wright, Sir William, 164; Wurtz, M., 139
- YELVERTON, Hon. William H., 136
- “OREGON,” the, and the *America*, ocean race between, 38
- ORIENTAL Bank, failure of, 14
- OXFORD, admission of women to certain degree examinations sanctioned in Convocation, 13
- PAILLERON, M., succeeds M. Louis Blanc at the French Academy, 3
- PALL MALL GAZETTE, circulars addressed by the manager to the Liberal members of the House of Commons [3]; list of questions [47]
- PANAMA Canal construction, progress of [421]; President Cervera impeached and reinstated [421]. The *Morro* conflict [422]
- PAPUA or New Guinea [432]; the British Protectorate proclaimed [433], 37; English flag hoisted [433]; German annexation [425], and flag hoisted [433]
- PARK Club, the, St. James's, judgment against, 20
- PARKS Railway Bill rejected, 16
- PARLIAMENT.—Opening of [15], 39
- QUEEN'S SPEECH [16]; on opening of winter session [233]; address in the Lords [18]; prorogued [197]; Recess, Easter [63]; Whitauntide [129]; ‘secret negotiations’ [146]; session, winter [233]; summary, general [267]; adjourned, 48
- ADDRESS, debates upon the [19]; reply moved by Hon. A. Elliot [20]; Mr. Bourke's amendment [20]; collapse [21]; adjourned [21]; Mr. Gladstone's explanations [21]; Mr. Chaplin's amendment [23]; agreed to [45]
- AFRICA, South, affairs [240], [259]
- ARMY, vote for increased expenditure in Egypt [55]; estimates [170]
- BANKRUPTCY Bill, the, appointments under [167]. BISHOPS, their removal from the House of Lords [178]. BRAND, Sir Henry, retires from the Speakership [49]. BUDGET [186]; supplementary [260]
- CENSURE, vote of, on the Government policy in Egypt [28]; postponed [28]; in the Lords [28]; carried [32]; second [65]; results [70]; third [81]. COLONIAL defences [261-263]; and foreign affairs [231]. CONGO treaty [166]. COMMITTEES, grand [48]. CONFERENCE, the bases of [75]; Parliament on [76]; meeting of the delegates [79]; its seven sittings [83]; end of [85]. CONTAGIOUS Diseases Bill (animal) [175]. COPYHOLDS, enfranchisement of [177]
- DECEASED Wife's Sister Marriage Bill [179]
- EGYPT, report on its financial condition [81]; affairs [258]; withdrawal of the troops [53]. ELECTIONS:—Brighton [49], 7; Cambridgeshire, 9; Cork, 7; Cromarty, 29; Devon (South), 28; Down, County of, 46; Greenock, 45; Hackney, 44; Hants (South), 19; Huntingdon, 9; Knareborough, 48;

ORANGE, the Prince of, his funeral at Delft, 24

ORATORIAN Fathers at Brompton, new church opened, 13

PARLIAMENT, continued

Leicester [167]; Lincoln, 19; London-derry, 2; Norfolk (West), 6; Northampton, 6; Poole, 12; Scarborough, 40, 45; Somersetshire (West) [48], 6; Surrey (Mid), 20; Warwickshire (North), 21; (South), [245], 41

FRANCHISE Bill, the [87]; debate on [98]; read the first time [98]; second reading [99]; instructions to the Committee [117]; in Committee [122]; passed by the Commons [137]; sent to the Lords [137]; Lord Cairns' amendment [139]; accepted [144]; secret negotiations [146]; in the Commons [248]; second reading [245]; sent to the Lords [247-250]; passed [257]

GOLD Coinage Bill [188]. GORDON, General, mission [53]; debate on [58].

GOVERNMENT of London Bill [180]

HOUSING of the Poor [46]

INCOME Tax, increase of [260]. IRELAND, state of [25]; extension of the Franchise Bill [101]. IRISH Land Law Act [190]

MERCHANT Shipping Bill [168]. MULTIPLE Control, the [72]. MUSEUMS, opening on Sundays [179]

NATIONAL Debt Conversion Bill [189]. NAVY Estimates [172]; state of [229], [268-267]

RAILWAYS Regulation Bill [169]. REDISTRIBUTION scheme, draft of [221]; Bill introduced [254]; opinions of the Press [255]; second reading [257]

SESSION, work of the, since February, 25; Fifth of the Tenth Parliament of Queen, opened, 5

TAXATION, local [180]. TRANSVAAL affairs [162]

WOMEN'S Suffrage [133]

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES.—ARGYLL, Duke of, on the Redistribution Bill [140]; advances of Russia [159]

BARTLETT, Mr. Ashmead, on the Egyptian policy of the Government [55]

BAXTER, Mr., on the Franchise Bill [102]. BOURKE, Mr., on General Gordon's policy [56].

BRADLAUGH, Mr., his self-administered oath [26].

BRASSEY, Sir Thomas, on the state of the Navy [265]. BRIGHT, Mr., at Birmingham [8], [9], [156]; on the Franchise Bill [101]; at Manchester [155].

BRODRICK, Mr., motion to exclude Ireland from the franchise [123]

CADOGAN, Lord, amendment [150]; adopted [152]. CAIRNS, Lord, on the Vote of Censure [30]; amendment on second reading of Franchise Bill [138]; accepted [142].

CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, on the Navy Estimates [173]; Chief Secretary for Ireland [231].

CARNARVON, Lord, on the Franchise [141]; at Nostell Priory [201]; on the Colonial defences [261].

CHAMBERLAIN, Mr., at Newcastle [6], [13]; at Birmingham [8]; on the Franchise Bill [105]; the Irish question [106]; at Hanley [220]; in Wales [228]; on

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES, cont.

the Aston Park riots [238]. CHAPLIN, Mr., on the Cattle Disease Bill [23].

CHILDERS, Mr., on the future policy of the Government [40].

CHURCHILL, Lord R., on the collapse of the debate [21].

Mr. GLADSTONE's defence [36]; at Birmingham [63], [185]; on the Franchise [93]; and the Council of the National Union [119]; letter to Lord Salisbury [119-121]; amend-

ment on the Address [238]. COURTNEY, Mr., resignation [256].

COWEN, Mr. J., on the Egyptian expedition [56]; disasters in Egypt [41].

CRANBROOK, Lord, on the advance of Russia [159].

CROSS, Sir R., at Hull and Bootle [12]

DEBBY, Lord, on the Franchise [142]; South African affairs [241].

DILKE, Sir C., at Kensington [7]; on General Gordon's mission [13]; reply to Mr. Forster [38]; at Oldham [227]; Manchester [228].

DUNRAVEN, Lord, on the removal of Lord Rossmore [46]

FAWCETT, Mr., at Hackney [227]. FITZMAURICE, Lord E., on Egyptian affairs [40]; on behalf of the Government [56].

FORSTER, Mr. W. E., on the Vote of Censure [37]; General Gordon's position [68]; the Franchise Bill [97]; its extension to Ireland [107]; at Batley [213].

FOWLER, Mr., and the Franchise Bill [93]

GIBSON, Mr., on the state of Ireland [25]; Mr. Gladstone's speech [67].

GLADSTONE, Mr., on the prolonged crisis in agriculture [6]; defence of the ministerial policy for Egypt [35]; Sir H. Brand's retirement [49]; Egyptian question [53]; defence of the Egyptian affairs [60-62]; General Gordon's position [64]; the proposed conference [65], [71], [78]; reply to Sir M. Hicks-Beach [66]; Lord Northbrook's mission [86]; speech on the Franchise Bill [87-93]; reply to the debate [109-111]; on obstructive speaking [116]; Irish franchise [117], [124]; Mr. Wooddall's amendment [133]; attitude of the Government [136]; statement at the Foreign Office [144]; in Edinburgh [208-207]; Aberdeen [209]; Perth [211]; Carlisle [213]; on the Aston riots [239]; and the Franchise Bill [242].

GORST, Mr., on the Franchise Bill [244]; Sir C. Warren's mission to Bechuanaland [260].

GOSCHEN, Mr., at Ripon [9]; on the Vote of Censure [42]; General Gordon's mission [69]; the Franchise Bill [95]; his reasons for voting against the Government [111-113].

GRAVILL, Lord, on the Vote of Censure [29]; despatch to the chargé d'affaires at Cairo [71]; on the death of the Duke of Albany [183]; reply to Lord Salisbury [234].

GREY, Earl, on the European Control [73]. GREY, Mr. A., at Hexham [5]

HARCOURT, Sir W., on the Government majority [115]; the Government of London Bill [181].

HARDWICKE,

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES, *cont.*

Lord, on General Gordon's position [62]. HARRISON, Mr. F., on European Control [74]. HARTINGTON, Lord, on the policy of Egyptian affairs [42]; a Supplementary Army Vote [53]; on Zebehr Pasha's appointment [54]; reply to Mr. Forster [69]; the Franchise Bill [102]; at Manchester [155]; on the Army Estimates [170]; compromise [218-220]; at Chatsworth [226]. HATTON, Mr. F., on the Egyptian question [54]. HAY, Sir J., amendment to the Franchise Bill [92]; on the Navy Estimates [172]. HICKS-BEACH, Sir M., on South African affairs [22]; proposes a Vote of Censure [65]; on the Franchise Bill [107]; at Tetbury [114]. JAMES, Sir H., on behalf of the Government [113]; on the Franchise Bill [130]. KIMBERLEY, Lord, on the Vote of Censure [31]; moves the second reading of the Representation of the People Bill [189]. LABOUCHERE, Mr., defence of Mr. Bradlaugh [26]; on the cost of the Egyptian expedition [53]; the loss of British and Arab life [56]; on the Franchise Bill [25]. LAING, Mr., on General Gordon's position [67]. LAWSON, Sir W., at Maryport [12]; on Egyptain affairs [37]. LEFEVRE, Mr. Shaw, at Manchester [7]. LOWTHER, Mr. J., on the Franchise Bill [102]. MANNERS, Lord J., on Mr. Gladstone's defence [62]; amendment on the second reading of the Franchise Bill [99-101]. MARRIOTT, Mr., severance from his party [41]. McLAREN, Mr., on the "one man one vote" [128]; amendment rejected [129]. MORLEY, Mr. J., on Egyptian affairs [39]; at St. James's Hall [156]; at Newcastle-on-Tyne [209]; at Leeds [253]. MUNDILLA, Mr., and the Education Estimates [194]. NORTHBROOK, Lord, on the state of the Navy [264]. NORTHCOTE, Sir S., at Barnstaple [14]; on the Vote of Censure [33]; his resolutions rejected [44]; on the Speaker's retirement [50]; Egyptian affairs [54], [60]; on the Conference [77]; Anglo-French agreement [86]; the Franchise Bill [97]; summing up on behalf of the Opposition [113]; on a Redistribution Bill [127]; on Mr. Gladstone's speech on the opposition of the Lords [136]; at King's Lynn [154]; Nostell Priory [201]; Edinburgh [208]; Newcastle-on-Tyne [210]; on the Address [235]; Aston riots [289]. O'BRIEN, Mr., on the condition of Ireland [24]. O'CONNOR POWER, Mr., on the Parnellite policy [44]. PARNELL, Mr., on the Speaker's retirement [50]; view of the Franchise Bill [97]. PLAYFAIR, Sir Lyon, on the Cattle Plague Bill [175]. PLUNKET, Mr., on the Franchise Bill [108].

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES, *cont.*

REDESDALE, Lord, and the Government [152]. RICHMOND, Duke of, amendment on Lord Carlingford's Bill [46]. ROBINSON, Sir H., on Transvaal affairs [162]. ROSEBERRY, Lord, motion to reform the House of Lords [192]. RUSSELL, Mr. C., on the Franchise Bill 108. SALISBURY, Lord, at Dorchester [7]; proposes his Vote of Censure [28]; on the housing of the poor [46]; General Gordon's mission [68]; at Manchester [64]; at Devonport [71]; on the Conference [76]; on the outcome of it [85]; the Franchise Bill [99], [143], [151], [249], [251]; reply to Sir W. Harcourt [115]; at Plymouth [131]; Sheffield [153]; Birmingham [157]; in Scotland [215-217]; on the Redistribution Bill [225]; on the Address [234]. SEXTON, Mr., charges against Mr. Bolton [196]. SMITH, Mr. W. H., at Dublin [8]; on the Franchise Bill [95]. STANHOPE, Mr. E., on the policy of the Home Government [87]. STANLEY, Col., on the Egyptian question [53]; amendment on the Franchise Bill [125]; defeated [128]. TREVELYAN, Mr., on the Franchise Bill [97]; at Glasgow [207]; in the Cabinet, 231. WALES, the Prince of, on the housing of the poor [47]. WALTER, Mr., on the Franchise Bill [94]. WARR, Lord De la, on over-pressure in the Board schools, 194. WEMYSS, Earl, on the second reading of the Franchise Bill [189], [148]; motion defeated [162]. WOODALL, Mr., on women's suffrage [133]; negatived [135]. PATTI, Madame Adeline, divorced from the Marquis de Caux, 42. St. PAUL'S School opened at Hammer-smith, 25. PEABODY Donation Fund, the Nineteenth Annual Report, 5. PEEL, Mr. A. W., elected Speaker of the House of Commons [51], 7. PEYS, Samuel, monument bust unveiled at St. Olave's, 9. PETERBOROUGH Cathedral, first stone laid by the Earl of Carnarvon, 14. PLUNKET, Lord, elected Archbishop of Dublin, 50. POLICE, the Annual Report of the Chief Commissioners of the number of houses built in 1883, 30. POLLOCK, Baron, judgment in Sir P. Heywood v. Bishop of Manchester, 4. PORTUGAL.—ARMY Reform Bill [332]. BUDGET [332]. CONGO Treaty [333]. "Conservative-Liberal" party [332]. ELECTION Bill [331]. PROGRESSIVAS, meeting of [334]. RAILWAYS, Board of Directors [333]. VATICAN, the, difficulty between, 39. PREECE, W. H., on electric lighting, at the Royal Society of Arts 47. PRIME Meridian Conference, the, at Washington, 30.

- QUARTERLY Review, the, on the tactics of the Conservative party [10]
- QUEEN Victoria's letter to her people on the death of the Duke of Albany [184], 12; still suffering from her accident, 4
- QUEENSLAND [428]; labour traffic, abuse of [428]; Neil McNeil's trial [428]; external policy [429]
- RABBETH, Dr. S., his life sacrificed to a child suffering from diphtheria, 87
- RACES.—ALTCAR Coursing Meeting, 6. ASCOT, 19. CASTRIE, Duc de, "Little Duck," 18. Championship of the World between E. Hanlan and E. C. Laycock, 16. CHESTER Cup, 14. DONCASTER, St. Leger, 38. EPSOM, the Derby, Grand Prize, and Oak Stakes, 17. Spring Meeting, 18. GOODWOOD, 26. HENLEY Regatta, 22. INTER-UNIVERSITY Athletic Sports, 12. LIVERPOOL Grand National Steeplechase, 10. NEWMARKET, 13, 14, 36, 87, 39. SCULLING match on Paramatta River, 29; at Putney, 4, 8. UNIVERSITY Boat Race, 11
- RACING stud of the Dowager Duchess of Montrose sold at public auction, 36
- RAILWAY, Metropolitan, inner circle of, completed, 36
- World, the, project for connecting the American lines with those of Russia, 29
- REDCLIFFE, Lord Stratford de, his monument unveiled in Westminster Abbey, 16
- REDISTRIBUTION Bill, the, meeting of the Conservative party at the Carlton Club, 47; of the Liberal members at the Foreign Office, 47
- ROBINSON, Mary, "Queen of the Costermongers," buried in Finchley Cemetery, 2
- ROBSON, Inspector, of the Thames Police, supposed drowning, 38
- "RODNEY," H.M.S., launched at Chatham, 36
- ROSCOE, Professor Henry, receives knighthood, 46
- RUSSIA.—ANTI-JEWISH riot at Kunarvin, 19
- BUDGET, state of the [306]
- CZAR and Czarina at Warsaw, 38
- FOREIGN policy [309]
- INDIAN frontier, advance to the [158]
- KASAN, powder magazine and five Government offices blown up, 28
- MERV, submission of [307]
- NIHILISTS, capture of [308]; fourteen, tried for political offences, 37
- SECRET police, agent to the, assassinated, 4. SKIERNIEWICZ, the Emperors of Austria and Germany received by the Czar, 34. SOBOLOFF, General, letter in the *Russ*, 310
- WARSAW, attempt to liberate some political prisoners, 31; plot to assassinate the Czar, 25
- 85, 86; at Dumfries, 39; at a meeting of the Committee of the Cabinet on Redistribution, 45
- SALMON, a, of enormous size netted in the Tay, 48
- SCHOOL Board Rate, meeting at the Mansion House to protest against, 9
- SCIENCE, retrospect of, 95
- ASTRONOMY.—Faculae in the sun, 103; sun's diameter, 103; temperature, 103; the planets, Jupiter, 103; Mars, 104; new comets, 104; the comet Pons Brooks, 104; universal first meridian, 105
- BIOLOGY.—Egg-laying mammals, 95; new species of wild horse, 96; the virus of hydrophobia, 96; cholera germ, 96
- CHEMISTRY.—New method of organic synthesis, 97; manufacture of soda and chlorine, 97; specific magnetic rotation in chemical compounds, 98; catalytic action of water, 98
- GEOGRAPHY.—Polar meteorological stations, 105; Africa, 107; exploration of New Guinea, 108; Australia and New Zealand, 108; Central Asia, 109; Panama Canal, 110; deep sea soundings, 110
- GEOLOGY AND PALAEONTOLOGY.—Determination of the age of strata by their fossil remains, 100; ancient fossil fish, 100; fossil skull, 100; fossil reptiles from the Jurassic strata of America, 101; age of the crystalline rocks of Durness, 101; triassic rocks under London, 101; recent earthquake shocks, 102; the Essex earthquake, 102; eruption of Krakatoa, 102
- PHYSICS.—New pattern of safety lamp, 99; electrical standards, 99; balloon steering, 99
- "SHAKSPERIAN Show," the, at the Albert Hall, 15
- SHAPIRA, Dr., commits suicide, 8
- SHAW-LEFEVRE, Rt. Hon. G. J., appointed Postmaster-General, 43
- SHEFFIELD, annual meeting of the Conservative National Union [155]
- SHERBORNE School, Dorset, Seventeenth Conference of Head Masters of the principal public schools, 52
- SHIPBUILDING trade, depression in, 51
- SHIPPING DISASTERS.—"Active," chain blown away, 42; "Alliance," wreck, 48; "Chelydra" and "Holmstrand," collision, 52; "City of Columbus," wreck, 3; "Clarence" Reformatory Ship, burnt, 3; "Daniel Steinman," wreck, 11; "Defence" and "Valiant," collision, 25; "Dione" and "Camden," collision, 26; "Gijon" and "Laxholm," collision, 25; "Pochard," foundered, 48; "Ponema" and "State of Florida," collision, 12; "Simla" and "City of London," collision, 4; "Wasp," wreck, 35.
- SIMMONS, Sir J. Lintorn, Governor of Malta, 10
- SKYE, ejection of crofters, 40; resisted by them, 42; large body of marines landed, 43; fresh demonstrations, 49; ringleaders arrested, 58
- SALISBURY, Lord, on the "Value of Redistribution" [213-215]; at Glasgow,

- SMALL-POX, spread of, throughout the metropolis, 20
- SMITH, Mr. W. H., on the state of the Navy [230]
- SNOWSTORM in the midland and northern counties, 47
- SOCIAL Science Congress, the, at Birmingham, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre's address, 34; Mrs. Kendall on the "drama," 35
- SOUTHWOLD, waterspouts seen, 25
- SPAIN.—ANDORRE, Republic of, disturbances in [329]. ANGO-SPANISH commercial treaty [330]
- CABINET, resignation of the [326]. CORTES, dissolution of [327]; opening of [328]
- EARTHQUAKES [331]
- FACTORIES established north of Senegal [330]
- KING's speech, and the counterdraft of the Fusionistas [326]
- LOCUSTS, crops destroyed by, 29
- MADRID, conspiracy discovered at, 9; explosion of a bomb, 19. MOROCCO, relations with [330]
- NEWSPAPER editors, prosecution of [327]
- STUDENTS' demonstration [329]
- ZORRILLA's conspiracy [327]
- SPEAKER, the illness of, 10
- "STANDARD," the, and the Redistribution scheme [221], 37
- STANLEY, H. M., address at the Scottish Geographical Society, Edinburgh, 47
- STAPLETON Bretherton, Mrs., her bequest of 400,000*l.* to Pope Leo XIII., 4
- STEPHEN, Mr. Justice, on Dr. Price's cremation case, 5
- STORMS—in Central Europe, 28; at Vienna, 49; in northern parts of France and the English Channel, 51
- STRIKE at Bradford, 22
- SUICIDE, two cases of, in Hyde Park, 14
- SUNSTROKE, cases of, 28
- SWEDEN.—MINISTRY, slight change in [343]
- REVENUE, state of [342]
- RIKSDAG, the opening of [342]
- STOCKHOLM elections [343]
- THEATRES, the two State [343]
- SWITZERLAND.—ANARCHISTS' right of asylum [324]
- BASLE, Catholic schools in [324]
- CANTONAL constitutions, revision of, 323
- ELECTIONS for the renewal of the National Council [325]
- FEDERAL Penal Code [324]
- TESSIN, Canton of, and the Italian Custom-house officers [325]
- SYSTON Park Library, sale concluded, 51
- TASMANIA [429]; mining industry [429]
- TAWHIAO, King, and the three New Zealand chiefs arrive in England, 29
- TELEPHONE Companies, concessions to, 27
- TENNYSON, Lord, takes his seat in the House of Lords, 8
- THERMOMETER, heat registered at Greenwich Observatory, 28
- THOMAS, Sons, & Co., Messrs., failure of, 4
- THUNDERSTORM over London, 14
- "TICHBORNE Claimant," the, released from Pentonville prison, 38
- TOULON, outbreak of cholera, 20
- TRADES Union Congress, the, meeting at Aberdeen, 33
- TREVELYAN, Mr. G., Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, 39
- TRICYCLE, Mr. H. J. Webb accomplished his journey from the Land's End to John o' Groat's, 31
- TURKEY.—CRETE, grievances in [313]
- PORTE, the, and its postal service [314]
- ROUMANIA, elections in [313]. ROUMELIA, Eastern, M. Christovitch appointed Governor [312]
- SERBIA, new Kingdom of [310]; Army Re-organisation Bill [311]. SERVO-BULGARIAN dispute [315]
- ZANKOFF, his manifesto [314]
- TYNDALE, W., his statue unveiled on the Thames Embankment, 14
- TYNESIDE, distress at, 38
- UNITED STATES.—ARTHUR, President, on the dynamite outrages in England [400]
- BLAIR Education Bill [401]
- CABLE, new Atlantic [408]. CINCINNATI, attack on the gaol, 10. CIVIL Service Law [398]
- DEMOCRATIC National Convention at Chicago [403]
- FINANCIAL position [406]
- "LASKER incident," the [399]
- NAVY, enlargement of [398]. NICARAGUA canal [405]. NEGRO disturbances, 41
- "PLATFORM," the [402], [403]. PRESIDENTIAL elections [403], [404], 41
- SENATE and House of Representatives [397]
- TRADE, state of [407]
- "VANCOUVER" steamer, quick passage to Canada, 33
- VICTORIA [423]; Sydney Convention petition to establish the Federal Council [424]; Budget [424]; Oriental Bank, effect of its failure [424]; New Guinea protectorate [425]
- VIRGINIA, North-west, fatal epidemic in, 44
- VOLUNTEERS, the, assembled at Dover, Aldershot, and Portsmouth, 12
- WALES, the Prince of, arrived at Portsmouth with the body of the Duke of Albany, 10; at the Festival of Railway Guards' Friendly Society, 22
- and Princess, laid a memorial stone of the new bridge at Putney, 24; at Newcastle-on-Tyne, 29; open a new dock, 30; in Edinburgh, 30; at Aberdeen, 31
- , Prince Albert Victor of, his maiden speech at Cambridge, 16
- WALLEY Park, affray between poachers and constables, 42
- WARRE, Rev. E., elected Head Master of Eton College, 26

- "WASP" gunboat, court-martial on the survivors, 36
 WATERSPOUTS seen off Southwold, 25
 WELDON, Mrs., obtains a verdict against Dr. Semple, 26; v. Winslow concluded, 46
 WELLINGTON, Duke of, statue removed to Aldershot, 28
 WEST INDIES [412]
 CUBA, Argüero's rebellion [414]; reduction of export duty on sugar [415]
 HAYTI, rebellion crushed [415]
 SUGAR, high import and export duties [412]
 TRINIDAD, low price of sugar [413]; Mohurrum festival [414]
 WINDWARD Islands, fiscal system [413]
 WESTON, E., completed his walk of 5,000 miles, 9
 WHEAT, average price of, 31
 WILLIAM the Silent, tercentenary celebration of his death, 23
 WILLIS, Mr., his resolution to relieve the Bishops from attendance in the House of Lords negatived, 9
 WILLS, Mr. A., Q.C., appointed one of the judges of the High Court, 25
 WINCHESTER, 700th anniversary of the incorporation of the City, 22
 WOLSELEY, Lord, departure for Egypt and the Soudan [231], 31
 WOLVES driven by the cold from the Carpathian Mountains, 44
 WYCLIFFE, quincentenary of his death, 24
 YATES, Mr. Edmund, sentenced to four months' imprisonment for libel, 10
 ZAMBESI, general rising of the natives, 30
 ZEBRHR Pasha rejected [59]
 "ZEPHYR," the British gunboat, fired upon by the Chinese, 32

Stanford University Libraries



3 6105 013 424 879

NON-CIRCULATING

Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California

Return this book on or before date due.

